

MARY WOLLSTONECRAFT'S GHOST

The Fate of the Female Philosopher
in the Romantic Period



ANDREW MCINNES

Wollstonecraft's Ghost

Focusing on the ways in which women writers from across the political spectrum engage with and adapt Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in order to advocate feminist reform, Andrew McNnes explores the aftermath of Wollstonecraft's death, the controversial publication of William Godwin's memoir of his wife, and Wollstonecraft's reception in the early nineteenth century. McNnes positions Wollstonecraft within the context of the eighteenth-century female philosopher figure as a literary archetype used in plays, poetry, polemic and especially novels to represent the thinking woman and address anxieties about political, religious and sexual heterodoxy. He provides detailed analyses of the ways in which women writers such as Mary Hays, Elizabeth Hamilton, Amelia Opie, and Maria Edgeworth negotiate Wollstonecraft's reputation as personal, political, and sexual pariah to reformulate her radical politics for a post-revolutionary Britain in urgent need of reform. Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* and Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*, McNnes suggests, work as state-of-the-nation novels, drawing on Wollstonecraft's ideas to explore a changing England. McNnes concludes with an examination of Mary Shelley's engagement with her mother throughout her career as a novelist, arguing that Shelley gradually overcomes her anxiety over her mother's stature to address Wollstonecraft's ideas with increasing confidence.

Andrew McNnes is Senior Lecturer in English Literature at Edge Hill University, UK.

This page intentionally left blank

Wollstonecraft's Ghost

The Fate of the Female Philosopher in the Romantic Period

Andrew McInnes

First published 2017
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

and by Routledge
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2017 Andrew McInnes

The right of Andrew McInnes to be identified as author of this work has been asserted by him in accordance with sections 77 and 78 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Trademark notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation without intent to infringe.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Names: McInnes, Andrew, author.

Title: Wollstonecraft's ghost : the fate of the female philosopher in the Romantic period / by Andrew McInnes.

Description: New York : Routledge, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2016010020 | ISBN 9781138696334 (alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: English literature--19th century--History and criticism. | English literature--18th century--History and criticism. | Women in literature. | Women philosophers. | English literature--Women authors--History and criticism. | Philosophy in literature. | Romanticism--England. | Wollstonecraft, Mary, 1759-1797--Influence.

Classification: LCC PR468.W6 M35 2017 | DDC 820.9/928709034--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2016010020>

ISBN: 978-1-138-69633-4 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-315-52317-0 (ebk)

Typeset in Sabon
by Taylor & Francis Books

For Abbi, because she's foolproof

This page intentionally left blank

Contents

<i>Acknowledgement</i>	viii
Introduction: I'm not a female philosopher, but ...	1
1 Imagining Mary: Representations of Wollstonecraft in the works of Mary Hays and William Godwin	22
2 The death of the feminist in Amelia Opie's <i>Adeline Mowbray</i> , Elizabeth Hamilton's <i>Modern Philosophers</i> and Maria Edgeworth's <i>Belinda</i>	60
3 England in Eighteen Hundred and Fourteen: The state of the nation in Frances Burney's <i>The Wanderer</i> and Jane Austen's <i>Mansfield Park</i>	98
4 Hideous progeny: The female philosopher in Gothic, historical and silver fork fiction	132
5 Afterword: The afterlives of the female philosopher	169
<i>Bibliography</i>	175
<i>Index</i>	193

Acknowledgement

The image of Mary Wollstonecraft on the front cover of this monograph is a posthumous, counter-revolutionary caricature of the (in)famous writer and thinker. I am haunted by this woman's provocative stare as much as I am entertained by the jaunty angle of her top hat – I feel that the grainy, black and white image perfectly encapsulates the idea of Wollstonecraft's ghost: the figure challenges the viewer as Wollstonecraft continued and continues to exhort readers and writers to live up to her life and writing. Thanks to the National Portrait Gallery, London, for permission to use the image.

I would also like to thank Taylor and Francis for permission to reproduce a small section from my article 'Feminism in the Footnotes: Wollstonecraft's Ghost in Mary Hays's *Female Biography*' *Life Writing* 8.3 (2011), 273–81 (see www.tandfonline.com) in Chapter 1; Pickering and Chatto for permission to reproduce another small section from my chapter 'Amazonian Fashions: Lady Delacour's (Re)Dress in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*' *Picturing Women's Health*, eds. F.M. Scott, Kate Scarth and Ji-Won Chung (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014), 29–44 in Chapter 2; and Cambridge Scholars Publishing for a snippet of "Better Known as Rosa Matilda": Charlotte Dacre's Authorial Doppelganger' *Women & Gothic*, ed. Maria Purves (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2014), 97–112 which appears in Chapter 4.

Over the course of writing this book, I have accrued many debts which I fear I will be unable to repay. However, I would like to thank Jane Spencer and Adeline Johns-Putra for their unflagging intellectual support for the project. Their constructive and incisive feedback has improved this work in more ways than I can say. They remain my models of how to be an academic: intellectually exacting, caring towards students, and passionate about their work.

Thanks to the English staff at the University of Exeter's Tremough campus, particularly Jason Hall, for pointing me in the right direction, and Nick Groom, for mentoring me throughout my time there, but also to: Jess Allsop, Jo Esra, Victoria Gibbons, Marion Gibson, Kyriaki Hadjiafxendi, Kate Hext, Jim Kelly, Ayesha Mukherjee, Alex Murray, Joanne Parker, Chloe Preedy, Rob Smith and Christopher Stokes; all excellent teachers, colleagues, and friends. Thanks also to my former fellow students in the now defunct postgrad corridor, for coffee and comradeship: Ben Carver, Jane Costin, Niamh Downing, Amal el-Mohtar,

Vanessa Hager and, most of all, Rebecca Mills, without whom this book would look very different and be impoverished for it. Further thanks to others at Tremough, both from Exeter and the University of Falmouth: Douglas Bell, Ruth Heholt, Christina Lake, Kym Martindale, Richard Noakes, Catriona Pennell, Faiz Sheikh and, especially, to Chrisy Dennis, conference pal par extraordinaire. I would also like to thank colleagues from up country, mostly for patient and exemplary editing: Amy Culley and Rebecca Styler, Maria Purves, Kate Scarth and Fran Scott. And to Isabelle Cosgrave, for Wollstonecraft Day, the Romanticism Reading Group, and irregular gossip and giggles. I would also like to thank my new place of work, Edge Hill University, for giving me time to finish this project, especially to Mike Bradshaw, Steve Van Hagen, Rob Spence and Jenny Barrett.

Research-led teaching and, less commonly, teaching-led research are buzzwords, but the students at Tremough, especially those in the eighteenth-century module 'Reason and Passion' but also in all those workshops, have directly and indirectly inspired my work, from the very early stages of this project through to nearly the very end – thank you! On the subject of teachers, I'd like to thank my old English teacher, Dr Engelberg (um, Karsten), for suggesting I read Wollstonecraft's *Letters from Sweden*, and for much else besides.

I would like to thank Ann Donahue at Ashgate for her patient and enthusiastic support for this monograph from the beginning, as well as the two anonymous readers whose careful criticism helped shape and refine the project. Ashgate titles were a source of inspiration for me throughout this project – an independent publisher with a flair for the unusual and a commitment to scholarship. Thanks also to Liz Levine and Nicole Eno at Routledge for smoothing an awkward transition, and Ashley Thorpe and Kris Wischenkamper for their work during the Production process.

Finally, I'd like to finish by thanking my family for their incredible support over the course of the last few years: mum and dad, without whom this whole enterprise would not have been possible; Auntie Sheila, for hospitality and several fact-checking missions; Lynsey and Nils, for academic solidarity; Jackie and John, for looking after us; and, above all, to Abbi, with love, for everything.

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

I'm not a female philosopher, but ...

I feel that I am neither a philosopher, nor a heroine, but a *woman, to whom education has given a sexual character*.

Mary Hays, *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*

The philosophical heroine of Mary Hays's revolutionary novel *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796) pinpoints the paradoxical position of the female philosopher in 1790s discourse about women's rights, education and situation in society. Whilst Emma demonstrates extensive knowledge of the philosophies of Rousseau, Helvétius, Godwin and Wollstonecraft to formulate her own idiosyncratic and inflammatory arguments defending the forceful expression of women's desires, she explicitly distances herself from either philosophy or heroism. However, her self-definition as a '*woman, to whom education has given a sexual character*' already accesses contemporary feminist philosophy to situate cultural conventions ('education', understood in its broadest sense) as imposing gendered expectations – a sexual character – on her personality. Characterised by explicit disavowal and implicit agreement, Mary Hays's ambiguous representation of the female philosopher influenced literary iterations of the figure throughout the 1790s and into the early nineteenth century.

Hays's ambivalent response to the female philosopher circled around her passionate engagement with her friend and mentor Mary Wollstonecraft's life and writing. Wollstonecraft was both celebrated and castigated, then and now, as the foremost female philosopher of the age, although, as I argue below, her own engagement with the figure was fraught with disavowal and disapproval. Hays offers later writers a complex range of approaches to the female philosopher: her conscious distancing of herself from the term is further developed in novels by women writers from Maria Edgeworth to Mary Shelley; her representation of Wollstonecraft in fiction and memoirs is used by later writers in their own romanticising of Wollstonecraft's life and writing in print; and her controversial self-representation as a sexually desiring, thinking woman is caricatured in order to divide the female philosopher into 'good' and 'bad', safe and dangerous, iterations. The female philosopher is characterized by her active interventions in political life; by her complex engagement with reading and writing, both of which hint darkly at impermissible expressions of sexual

2 Introduction

desire; and, finally, by that desire itself, either purged from the female body, leaving behind a threatening intellectualism, or tainting it, rendering the term ‘female philosopher’ oxymoronic by questioning the very ability of a woman to think rationally.

Critics such as Adriana Craciun, Claudia Johnson and Barbara Taylor have situated the female philosopher as an important, and contested, figure within early feminism, radical writing and the French Revolution debate in Britain, tending to elide the figure with representations of Mary Wollstonecraft herself. For example, Taylor entitles her first chapter on Wollstonecraft ‘The Female Philosopher’, connecting the history of the learned lady from the seventeenth to the late eighteenth century with Wollstonecraft’s career, reputation and reception.¹ Craciun also describes Wollstonecraft as the ‘Empress of Female Philosophers’, focusing her discussion on counter-revolutionary rhetoric against female philosophy.² Although I agree that Wollstonecraft’s posthumous reputation was often entangled with representations of the female philosopher, I will complicate this elision by analysing first, Wollstonecraft’s own suspicion of the term, and then, the way in which the figure is used by women writers to separate considerations of Wollstonecraft’s life and work from the female philosopher as literary construct. My first chapter begins by analysing how Mary Hays uses a model of the female philosopher figure drawing on Enlightenment and pro-revolutionary ideals to shape both her self-representation as a writer and her idealisation of Mary Wollstonecraft, examining the ways in which this model came under stress as the 1790s progressed. I then explore nineteenth-century depictions of the female philosopher which critiqued Hays’s model in order to split the figure into positive and negative iterations, sometimes shifting focus from these contrasting figures to new models of female behaviour. Johnson traces the development of the female philosopher through the eighteenth century, argues for her centrality in the debates of the 1790s, and suggests that she faded from English Literature around 1815.³ I trace the life of the female philosopher from the 1790s to 1814, when Frances Burney and Jane Austen engaged with the figure as a political and aesthetic representation of the intellectual possibilities open to women in post-revolutionary Britain (discussed in Chapter 3). Moreover, contra Johnson, I show how the figure developed in the 1820s and 1830s through my analysis of the continuing engagement with the term in examples of the Gothic, historical fiction and the silver fork novel, centred

- 1 See Barbara Taylor, *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 25–57, for her account of the reactions to female philosophy throughout Wollstonecraft’s writing career, tracking the scale of the changes in the connotations of the term female philosopher over the course of the 1790s.
- 2 See Adriana Craciun, *British Women Writers and the French Revolution: Citizens of the World* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005), 28–52, for her discussion of the importance of female philosophy both in Wollstonecraft’s self-representation and in the counter-revolutionary attacks on her life and work in the late 1790s.
- 3 See Claudia Johnson, *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 19–21, for her discussion of the female philosopher.

around Mary Shelley's nuanced response to the female philosopher and the legacy of her mother in her innovative writing within these genres (see Chapter 4). *Wollstonecraft's Ghost* rereads the narrative which has developed around Mary Wollstonecraft and the female philosopher, focusing on her own and others's anxieties about the term, which tend to be occluded in the studies above. I argue that these concerns are reconciled in a Romantic vision of the thinking woman, drawing on the combination of reason and passion in the imaginative faculty. Indeed, the imagination, linked to a balancing of reason and passion, is already a key term in Mary Hays and William Godwin's controversial celebration of Mary Wollstonecraft's life and writing. Wollstonecraft as female philosopher, then, appears as a crucial figure in the faultlines between Enlightenment and Romanticism, reason and passion, private and public sphere, at the end of the eighteenth century.

Mary Wollstonecraft, female philosopher?

Mary Wollstonecraft refused to categorise herself or her fictional characters, often thinly disguised representations of herself, as female philosophers. In the 'Advertisement' to her first, semi-autobiographical novel, *Mary, A Fiction* (1788), Wollstonecraft describes the work as 'an artless tale, without episodes, [in which] the mind of a woman, who has thinking powers is displayed'.⁴ Although she avoids using the term 'female philosopher' here, her celebration of the 'thinking powers' of a woman implicitly draws on eighteenth-century representations of the figure, discussed below, to celebrate her intellectual abilities. The 'Advertisement' expresses Wollstonecraft's concerns about the female philosopher, continuing 'The female organs have been thought too weak for this arduous employment; and experience seems to justify the assertion' (*Mary*, 5). Although this statement is double-edged, questioning the proposition it seems to agree with, it also shows Wollstonecraft's painful awareness of the prejudices obstructing women at the end of the eighteenth century. She concludes by situating her novel's 'Mary', based on many of her own experiences, as a fictional creation, in order to explore 'such a being ... whose grandeur ... derived from the operation of its own faculties, not subjugated to opinion; but drawn by the individual from the original source' (*Mary*, 5). In this 'Advertisement', Wollstonecraft transmutes the female philosopher figure into fiction, in order to explore her reasoning powers, stressing the religious underpinnings of her thought by linking them to a divine 'source'. Her desire to be 'not subjugated to opinion' will become a point of contention in representations of the female philosopher figure in the revolutionary tumult of the 1790s.

In her first explicitly political work, *A Vindication of the Rights of Men* (1790), Wollstonecraft contrasts her style of argument, which she characterises as direct, rational and masculine, with Edmund Burke's, which she satirises

4 Mary Wollstonecraft, *Mary, A Fiction* (1788) in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 1, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 5.

4 Introduction

throughout as effeminate, emotive and irrational.⁵ In responding to Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), Wollstonecraft deliberately contrasts her cool, philosophical stance as a writer with Burke's impassioned, and therefore, for Wollstonecraft, unreasonable polemic. In this polemic, first published anonymously Wollstonecraft adopts a neutral, implicitly masculine voice, again avoiding the use of the term 'female philosopher'. Later novels by Mary Hays, Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen, which I explore in the following chapters, replay this confrontation between Wollstonecraft and Burke in their depictions of young women, explicitly or implicitly drawing on the female philosopher figure, in conflict with older men.

In her most famous work, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, Wollstonecraft again avoids representing herself as a 'female philosopher'. Instead, she describes herself as a gender-neutral 'philosopher'. For example, she writes: 'As a philosopher, I read with indignation the plausible epithets which men use to soften their insults; and, as a moralist, I ask what is meant by such heterogeneous associations, as fair defects, amiable weaknesses, etc?' (*Vindication*, 103). Wollstonecraft dissociates herself from the epithet 'female philosopher' here, opting for the neutral, or even masculine, appellations of 'philosopher' and 'moralist'. She was perhaps aware of the complex literary legacy of the term 'female philosopher', although, ironically, she will come to be inextricably associated with it, particularly after her death.

The ambiguous status of Wollstonecraft as a female philosopher – she gestures towards the term, but refuses to use it to categorise herself – informs the critical response to the *Vindication*, with even positive reviews expressing reservations about her political engagement in the text. Wollstonecraft's feminist polemic was initially well received in 1792, catapulting her into celebrity status and being read generally as a sensible treatise on women's education, related to other works of women's writing explicitly referred to by Wollstonecraft such as Macaulay's *Letters on Education*.⁶ Several reviewers, however, already anxiously commented upon the work's radical politics – an anxiety which precipitated into active opprobrium in the late 1790s, particularly after Wollstonecraft's death.⁷ William Enfield, in the liberal *Monthly Review* of June 1792, positioned Wollstonecraft as a philosopher, and, like Wollstonecraft herself, carefully avoided gendering the term: 'In the class of philosophers, the *author* of this

5 Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Men* (1790) in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989).

6 Catharine Macaulay, *Letters on Education* (1790), (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

7 R.M. Janes, 'On the Reception of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*' *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39.2 (April–June 1978), 293–302, traces the history of reviews of this work from the early positive response through the reactionary opprobrium placed on it in the hindsight of Godwin's *Memoirs* into early nineteenth century attempts to salvage the reputation of both the work and the author.

treatise – whom we will not offend by styling, authoress – has a right to a distinguished place’.⁸ Enfield reviewed Wollstonecraft’s treatise sympathetically, stressing the virtues of her educational programme and emphasis on improving manners. However, he also voiced concern about Wollstonecraft’s radical politics: ‘We do not, however, so zealously adopt Miss W’s plan for a REVOLUTION in female education and manners, as not to perceive that several of her opinions are fanciful, and some of her projects are romantic’ (Rev. of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, 208–9), arguing against women ‘assuming an active part in civil government’ and for keeping the ‘distinction of sex’ which Wollstonecraft seeks to confound (209).

If Enfield, generally sympathetic to Wollstonecraft’s aims, expressed some hesitation about the more radical ideas underpinning her polemic, especially her arguments that women should take on a more active role in the public sphere of political action, the anonymous review published in the conservative *Critical Review* combined ridicule and condescension, covering up a certain amount of anxiety, to attack Wollstonecraft’s radical prospectus:

It may be fancy, prejudice, or obstinacy, we contend not for the name, but we are infinitely better pleased with the present system; and, in truth, dear young lady, for by the appellation sometimes prefixed to your name we must suppose you to be young, endeavour to attain ‘the weak elegance of mind’, the ‘sweet docility of manners’, ‘the exquisite sensibility’, the former ornaments of your sex; we are certain you will be more pleasing, and we dare to pronounce that you will be infinitely happier.⁹

The *Critical Review* attacks Wollstonecraft’s arguments for improved education, suggesting that superior intellectual and physical capabilities would lead to women refusing to nurse their children, instead competing with their potential husbands for ‘superiority of mind’ (‘Review’, 390), reversing her arguments against pleasing men by patronisingly suggesting she labour to please and be happy. The review chauvinistically concludes by arguing that rather than the rational, scientific and independent education posited by Wollstonecraft, ‘the conversation of a sensible man ... will teach better than books’ (392). Both Enfield’s review and this from the *Critical Review* lay stress on women’s role in the private sphere instead of the public, arguing against Wollstonecraft’s extension of the remit of women’s activities. Women writers of the early nineteenth century used Wollstonecraft’s writing to position themselves in the public sphere of literary production, able to comment on and critique the male-dominated public sphere of political action.

8 [William Enfield], Rev. of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, by Mary Wollstonecraft, *Monthly Review; or, Literary Examiner* 8 (May–June, 1792), (London: Richard Griffiths, 1792), 198–209, 198. Subsequent references, in-text.

9 Rev. of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, by Mary Wollstonecraft, *The Critical Review; or, Annals of Literature* 4 (1792) (London: A. Hamilton, 1792), 389–98, 390. Subsequent references, in-text.

6 Introduction

After the publication of Godwin's *Memoirs*, the *Anti-Jacobin Review* could savage Wollstonecraft's *Vindication* as a work:

which the superficial fancied to be profound, and the profound knew to be superficial: it indeed had very little title to the character of ingenuity ... Her doctrines are almost all obvious corollaries from the theorems of Paine. If we admit his principle, that all men have an equal right to be governors and statesmen, without any regard to their virtues and talents, there can be no reason for excluding women or even children.¹⁰

This brief sally against the *Vindication* forms part of a longer review attacking Godwin's *Memoirs* and Wollstonecraft's unfinished novel *Maria*, edited by Godwin, which sought to denigrate the couple's radical politics and revolutionary philosophies. The *Anti-Jacobin* subordinates Wollstonecraft's distinct ideas to Godwin's, and also to Paine's, as in the above passage, rather than treating them seriously in their own right. The review also focuses much more on her sexual history rather than on her writing as such, showing its writer to be both titillated and disgusted by Godwin's candid revelations. The *Anti-Jacobin* draws on negative representations of the female philosopher figure to cast doubt on Wollstonecraft's intellectual abilities, subordinating her individual achievements to the philosophies of radical men, and emphasising sexual desire above rational intercourse.

The history of the female philosopher

Why were Wollstonecraft and sympathetic reviewers so loathe to identify her with the female philosopher? How were her conservative critics able to use the figure to smear Wollstonecraft with accusations of sexual promiscuity? The history of the female philosopher figure through the eighteenth century offers explanations for Wollstonecraft's nervousness about the figure and the *Anti-Jacobin*'s gleeful appropriation of her. The female philosopher has a scattered presence throughout eighteenth-century writing, making appearances in novels, poems and plays, as well as biographical, historical and political texts, including educational pamphlets and religious debate. I use the term 'female philosopher' as a rhetorical figure, representing an ideal (or nightmare) of the thinking woman. Real, historical figures, such as Wollstonecraft herself, her friend Hays, and earlier women such as Elizabeths Montagu and Carter, were identified, or self-identified, as female philosophers. However, the figure achieves an existence independent of actual women as she accrues a set of literary conventions available to both pro- and counter-revolutionary writers throughout the 1790s, and

10 Rev. of *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*, by William Godwin, and *Posthumous Works*, ed. Godwin, *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 1 (July 1798) London: J. Plymsell et al., 1799, 95.

in post-revolutionary works of the early nineteenth century. Throughout the eighteenth century, this figure was both celebrated as an avatar of Enlightenment ideals, as a signifier of the progress of the intellect, rationality, and educational development, especially the expansion of women's literacy, and satirised or attacked as a contradiction in terms, an oxymoron. Even before the 1790s, then, the female philosopher is split between a figure of rational, if reserved, stoicism and unthinking promiscuity.

By the middle of the century, British philosophers such as David Hume and French *philosophes* such as Voltaire and Diderot were arguing that women deserved access to improved education in order to take on a vital role in the improvement of civic society.¹¹ The English term 'female philosopher', split between a progressive, rational interlocutor and a figure who embodies male anxieties about female sexuality, has its roots in the French Enlightenment's '*femme philosophe*' – a phrase which itself spans connotations from facilitator of rational discourse as a Parisian *salonnière* to the philosopher whore of French pornography.¹² From the 1750s to the 1780s, salons run by women in both countries encouraged the pursuit of learning through conversation.¹³ The Bluestocking circle surrounding Elizabeth Montagu (1718–1800) developed a 'bluestocking philosophy' which Elizabeth Eger describes as 'the social expression of an Enlightenment belief in freedom of enquiry ... concentrat[ing] on a Christian attention to practical virtue and social benevolence, which emphasised the importance of friendship and a rational adherence to duty'.¹⁴ Montagu's bluestocking philosophy created 'a public identity for the female intellectual and socially useful individual' (*Bluestockings*, 13), aligning her with the female philosopher figure I describe in this introduction. In Britain, Elizabeth Montagu's salon fostered work by Elizabeth Carter, Catherine Macaulay, Hannah More,

11 See Katherine B. Clinton, 'Femme et Philosophe: Enlightenment Origins of Feminism' *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8.3 (Spring 1975), 283–99, for a discussion of the transnational development of these early feminist ideas from France to England, describing the ways in which 'the woman question' was used to attack patriarchal structures in France and England by Enlightenment philosophers such as Voltaire, Diderot and Hume.

12 See Adriana Craciun, *Citizens of the World* for an analysis of the pornographic representations of female philosophers in French satire, used by counter-revolutionary writers in Britain to besmirch the reputation of early feminists such as Wollstonecraft and Hays.

13 See Dena Goodman, 'Enlightenment Salons: The Convergence of Female and Philosophic Ambitions' *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22.3 (Spring 1989), 329–50, for an analysis of women's role in refashioning French salons as centres of Enlightenment philosophy, and Deborah Heller, 'Bluestocking Salons and the Public Sphere' *Eighteenth-Century Life* 22.2 (1998), 59–82, for a discussion of the Bluestockings' impact on the public sphere by encouraging diversity through conversation.

14 Elizabeth Eger, *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), 13. The term 'Bluestockings' to describe first Montagu's visitors, then particularly the group of learned women associated with her, originated in the scholar Benjamin Stillingfleet's appearance at one of Montagu's assemblies in blue worsted stockings, normally associated with the working classes (12–14).

and Frances Burney. Elizabeth Carter represented the virtues of the female philosopher figure, ‘considered “the most learned lady” in the eighteenth century’.¹⁵ Carter’s greatest achievement was her translation of Epictetus, a stoic philosopher, prompting Samuel Johnson to declare her ‘the best Greek scholar in England’.¹⁶ This, and Carter’s other work, including her ‘Ode to Wisdom’ published in Richardson’s *Clarissa*, established her as a female philosopher.

Sarah Scott’s *Millenium Hall* (1762) distils her sister Elizabeth Montagu’s ‘bluestocking philosophy’ into fiction.¹⁷ The novel splices together a utopian representation of female community, combining artistic and cultural capital with charity work and industrial labour, and including (disconcertingly) a ‘zoo’ of misfits and outcasts, with individual case histories of the women who form the society, often refracting a range of eighteenth-century fictional tropes, including fashionable dissipation, abduction, attempted rape, unhappy marriage, and star-crossed love. *Millenium Hall* imagines a range of roles for women, even in seclusion from a world figured as violently threatening, including artist, industrialist and philosopher.

In her discussion of Bluestocking feminism, Moyra Haslett argues that later satires of the bluestocking split the historical Bluestocking from the figurative bluestocking who acted as a caricature of the learned, literary hostess.¹⁸ I find Haslett’s splitting of the historical Bluestocking from the satirical figure of the bluestocking useful in thinking about the literary nature of the female philosopher, as she is always already partly figurative, thriving in fictional form, and often in non-fiction a term cast back onto heterogeneous historical figures. She also draws on a similar tradition as the bluestocking satires: anxieties about the status of the learned lady and woman writer. Haslett concludes that whereas the Bluestockings themselves were often conservative in their social and political positions, the satirical bluestockings voice much more radical beliefs. She argues that ‘Paradoxically, then, the satires make feminists of the Bluestockings’ as ‘radicalism is bequeathed to them by the indignation and passion which they inspired’ (‘Bluestocking Feminism Revisited’, 444). Early feminists such as Wollstonecraft and Hays articulated political arguments already much more radical than either the historical Bluestockings or the satirical bluestockings. Nevertheless, a similar movement takes place in the depiction of the figurative female philosopher: the attacks on the female philosopher which gather force as the 1790s progress also reveal the radicalism which accrues to the figure as she becomes closely connected to revolutionary feminists like Wollstonecraft and Hays, instead of being read as part of an existing Enlightenment tradition. The female philosopher finally achieves an existence independent of historical, philosophical women, allowing later women

15 Priscilla Dorr, ‘Elizabeth Carter (1717–1806)’ *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 5.1 (Spring 1986), 138–40, 138. Quotation unidentified.

16 Quoted in ‘Elizabeth Carter (1717–1806)’, 138.

17 See Sarah Scott, *Millenium Hall*, ed. Gary Kelly (Peterborough, Broadview, 1995), which includes a detailed introduction and useful appendices to the novel.

18 Moyra Haslett, ‘Bluestocking Feminism Revisited: The Satirical Figure of the Bluestocking’, *Women’s Writing* 17.3, (Dec. 2010), 432–51.

writers to split their consideration of the figure from their rediscovery of the significance of Wollstonecraft's life and work in their fiction.

Throughout the eighteenth century, the positive iteration of the female philosopher often represented a stoic idea of composure amidst disappointment, especially resignation to the status quo, rather than the radical critique of it offered by Wollstonecraft. For example, Lady Woodville, a character in Elizabeth Griffith's *The Delicate Distress*, asks her friend 'is not the great use and end of that exalted study [philosophy], to render us happy, by perfectly acquiescing in our own lot, and wisely contemning [sic] all those advantages that are denied us?'.¹⁹ Positive representations of the female philosopher, like this, often read like defence formations. In an article from 1713, later much anthologised, the periodical essayist Joseph Addison proposes that 'Learning and knowledge are perfections in us, not as we are men, but as we are reasonable creatures, in which order of beings the female world is upon the same level as the male', adding the nervous encomium: 'At least, I believe everyone will allow me, that a female philosopher is not so absurd a character and so opposite to the sex, as a female gamester'.²⁰ Addison's appeal to include men and women in the same category of 'reasonable creatures' chimes with Wollstonecraft's later desire to see women as such. His comparison of the female philosopher with the female gamester hints that the former, if neither 'so absurd' nor 'so opposite to the sex' as the latter, is perceived as such by some of his readers. David Fordyce, brother of the James whose *Sermons for Young Women* Wollstonecraft deconstructs in *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, exhorts: 'Pray Madam ... do not be ashamed that you have appeared in the Figure of a female philosopher, nor affect to hide the Veneration you have for the Muses'.²¹ Fordyce's exhortation hints at the social awkwardness of inhabiting the persona of a female philosopher. In her *Memoirs*, Laetitia Pilkington describes her pleasure in the company of the female philosopher Constantia Grierson, whom she praises as 'Mistress of Hebrew, Greek, Latin and French, [who] understood the *Mathematicks* as well as most Men', but stresses that these talents appeared 'like the intuitive knowledge of Angels', depicting them as miraculous gifts rather than the hard-won achievements they must have been.²²

19 Elizabeth Griffith, *The Delicate Distress, A Novel in Letters*, vol. 1 of 2. (Dublin: Brett Smith, 1787), 85–6. Other examples include Agnes Maria Bennett, *Anna; or, Memoirs of a Welch Heiress* (London: William Lane, 1785) which includes a chapter entitled 'Female Philosophy', 206–24, depicting stoic resignation in the face of disappointment as exemplary moral behaviour, and Maria Smyth, *The Woman of Letters; or, The History of Miss Fanny Belton* (London: Francis Noble, 1783), in which the eponymous heroine's principles, as written in her poem 'The Female Philosopher', 211, are tested by her early marriage to a debtor.

20 Joseph Addison, *The Guardian*, 155 (Tuesday, 8 September 1713) anthologised in *The Works of the Late Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq.* vol. 4 of 4, 2nd ed. (London: Jacob Tonson, 1730), 231–3, 232.

21 David Fordyce, *Dialogues Concerning Education*, vol. 2 of 2. (London, [s.n.] 1745), 106.

22 Laetitia Pilkington, *The Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, Wife to the Rev. Mr. Matth. Pilkington, Written by Herself* (Dublin, 1748), 23. Emphasis in original.

In 1735, *True Taste; or, Female Philosophy* was published in response to *The Female Rake: or, Modern Fine Lady*: an exchange of poetic epistles between Libertina, a female rake or libertine, and Sylvia, an older, wiser woman, presented self-consciously as a new kind of character, a female philosopher. Libertina's letter defends her indulgence in sensual pleasures by citing male and female examples, arguing irreligiously for living in the moment, and pre-emptively attacking Sylvia's disapproval by presenting the older woman as aged and infirm. Sylvia's response bristles with indignation against these personal slurs, particularly that her love of books is merely an affectation, 'If with Desire for Knowledge I am fir'd, / How know'st thou it is but to be admir'd?'²³ She then attacks Libertina's lack of devotion as a 'new-fangled System ... / To blind your Judgment, and debauch your soul' (*True Taste*, 8), countering it by counselling religious resignation and repentance. Sylvia also engages with political concerns, giving 'thanks to Heav'n all Virtue's not yet fled, / Tho W — — 's at the Helm, and Patriotism dead' (11). Her attack on Walpole, the leader of the ruling Whig party, aligns her with opposition politics, along with writers from Henry Fielding to Samuel Johnson who also attacked Walpole, representing herself as virtuous and patriotic, and implicitly connecting Libertina's rakish demeanour with the corrupt policies of the Walpole administration.

A positive early depiction of the female philosopher, Sylvia already combines several key traits which will become defining characteristics of the figure throughout the eighteenth century: first and foremost, a love of learning and a desire for knowledge; secondly, a complex relationship towards sexual desire; thirdly, an engagement in religious controversy; and finally, political activism, explicitly connected to notions of personal and civic virtue, particularly patriotism. Although all of these traits become open to contention in later representations of the female philosopher, the second point relating to sexual desire is always particularly fraught, already troubling Sylvia's self-representation as chaste. She anxiously returns to the question of her relationship to sensuality throughout the poem, stressing that she has not grown virtuous with age, but was always so: 'Had I been in my Youth so loosely giv'n, / How came I now to abandon all for Heav'n?' (9). Sylvia's following question, directed at Libertina, 'Won't once a Whore still always be a Whore?' (9), will haunt later iterations of the female philosopher herself, leading to the *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine* infamously indexing Wollstonecraft under Prostitute in their first issue of 1798.

In negative depictions, the female philosopher was usually linked to sexual transgression, especially in religious discourse. In *Deism Revealed*, Philip Skelton gasps that 'Crates, and the female philosopher *Hipparchia*, made a practice of strolling from place to place, and lying together publicly before multitudes of people'.²⁴ Two apothegms in *The Koran*, variously attributed to

23 [Anon.], *True Taste: or, Female Philosophy. Being an Epistle from Sylvia to Libertina* (London: Nutt et al., 1735), 6. Subsequent references in-text.

24 Philip Skelton, *Opiomaches; or, Deism Revealed*, vol. 1 of 2. (London: A. Miller, 1751), 114. Emphasis in original.

Laurence Sterne and Richard Griffith, who included it in his edition of Sterne's works, also deal pruriently with female philosophers: Diotama is described as 'the person that initiated Socrates into the *philosophia amatoria*, which the Platonists afterwards extolled so highly' and Theano as 'another female philosopher, [who] used to advise married women to lay aside shame with their cloaths'.²⁵ Sexual transgression was also linked to male anxieties over the development of women's literacy through the figure of the female philosopher. Commenting on Jonathan Swift's relationship with Esther Vanhomrigh in the poem *Cadeneus and Vanessa*, John Boyle, Earl of Orrery, describes Vanessa first as 'a great reader, and violent lover of poetry' and then as 'a female philosopher [who] made a surprising progress in the philosophic doctrines [of Swift]. He taught her that vice, as soon as it defied shame, was immediately changed into virtue'.²⁶ Virtue, vice and shame, especially about the act of reading philosophy, recur as tensions within the female philosopher figure in later women's writing.

Before the 1790s, the female philosopher figure represented, at her best, a stoic resignation in the face of suffering and disappointment, at worst, an affectation of this, disguising literary pretensions or sexual profligacy. In the 1790s, the female philosopher was radicalised by the French Revolution debate, both through the connection with the French term 'femme philosophe' and because several important early feminists such as Wollstonecraft herself and her friend Mary Hays self-consciously identified as philosophers.²⁷ These women extended the remit of the figure to include more radical ideas: equality in male and female education, political engagement in the public sphere, heterodox religious beliefs, usually underpinned by relationships with Dissenting communities, and honest, often candid, expressions of female desire. From the mid- to late 1790s, counter-revolutionary writers slurred this radical interpretation of female philosophy, presenting the female philosopher as sexually profligate, irreligious to the point of profanity, and a force for social instability. These slurs aimed both to defend against the promulgation of revolutionary sympathy at home and to restrict women's sphere of movement to the home. The female philosopher's engagement with philosophy itself was also depicted as pedantic,

25 Richard Griffith, *The Posthumous Works of a Late Celebrated Genius, Deceased*, vol. 2 of 2. (London: W. and J. Robinson et al., 1770), 144. Emphasis in original.

26 John Boyle, Earl of Orrery, *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift* (Dublin: George Faulkner, 1752), 108, 112.

27 *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*, ed. Pamela Clemit (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011) offers an excellent, lucid introduction to the French Revolution debate in Britain over the course of the 1790s. In the opening chapter, H.T. Dickinson states: 'The Revolutionary debate of the 1790s in Britain had a profound influence on the political, religious and cultural life of the country, while the French war produced almost unprecedented economic and social strains, and forced Britain to make a huge military, naval and financial effort to counter French ambitions', 'The Political Context', 1–15, 1.

confused and derivative, a representation which sought to decouple the term, questioning the ability of a female to be a philosopher.

Women writers seeking to engage with Wollstonecraft's life and work also had to negotiate a way through these competing representations of the female philosopher figure, from avatar of Enlightenment to reactionary bogeywoman. For example, William Enfield, a Rational Dissenter, published an article, 'Are Literary and Scientific Pursuits suited to the Female Character?', in the *Monthly Magazine* of June 1796 which presented three female characters and their relationships to female philosophy. In her biography of Mary Hays, Gina Luria Walker links Enfield's Margaretta to Anna Laetitia Barbauld, his Sophia to Amelia Alderson, and Eliza to Hays, characterising 'Margaretta [as] wise and moderate, Sophia ... popular and flirtatious, and Eliza ... humorless and ideological'.²⁸ Even in a broadly sympathetic account of female philosophy, such as Enfield's, women are presented with a choice between the attractive and essentially unlearned Sophia and the intellectual yet dull Eliza. In order to negotiate the conflicting representations of the female philosopher, women writers developed a range of strategies including caricature and satire, the doubling of the female philosopher figure within their texts, and implicit or explicit allusions to radical literature, especially Wollstonecraft and Godwin's texts. These strategies either serve to distance their own work from radical writing or, more daringly, create a space for a renewed, more sympathetic interpretation of it.

Throughout the 1790s, the figure of the female philosopher, increasingly in her negative iteration as the decade progressed, became interlinked with the life and writing of Mary Wollstonecraft. In an extended response to the second *Vindication*, Benjamin Heath Malkin, writing in 1795, stressed that Wollstonecraft 'has been successful in setting those prejudices in a strong point of view', adding that he 'subscribe[s] most cordially to the truth of her philosophy'.²⁹ However, he concludes that 'abstruse philosophy' is not a suitable subject for women as it 'would carry them too far from the sphere of domestic concerns' (*Essays*, 278). Malkin equivocally supports Wollstonecraft's arguments, although he is concerned that female philosophy as such will disrupt women's position within the private sphere. Published two years later, Sophia, Lady Burrell's anonymous novel *Adeline de Courcy* shares similar concerns, although she is less equivocal in positioning herself against the female philosopher:

28 Gina Luria Walker, *Mary Hays (1759–1843); The Growth of a Woman's Mind* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 167. Barbauld (1743–1825) was a writer and poet from an important dissenting family. She is quoted disparagingly in Wollstonecraft's *Vindication* and replied in a poem entitled 'The Rights of Woman', criticising Wollstonecraft's conclusions in that work. Alderson, later Opie, wrote the novel *Adeline Mowbray*, analysing Wollstonecraft and Godwin's relationship in fictional form, which is discussed in my second chapter. Hays's life and work, and her personal and professional relationship with Wollstonecraft, is the focus of my first chapter.

29 Benjamin Heath Malkin, *Essays on Subjects Connected with Civilization* (London: E. Hodson, 1795), 257, 260. Subsequent references, in-text as *Essays*.

From a female politician I always turn with disgust ... I admire sensible intelligent beings, whatever their sex may be; but I abhor affectation, and would have women confined to their own province, exercising the mild virtues that belong to domestic life. If they have genius let them cultivate it, let them improve their minds by reading; but a female philosopher, a disputant in petticoats, is a conceited masculine character that does not suit my taste.³⁰

Even within Adeline's repudiation of the figure, there remains a respect for her Enlightenment ideals: she admires 'sensible intelligent beings' and licenses women to cultivate genius and 'improve their minds by reading'. In 1799, Hannah More launched a much more straightforward attack on the female philosopher in her *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*, in which she argued that 'A female Polemic wanders almost as much from the limits prescribed to her sex, as a female Machiavel or warlike Thalestris'.³¹ She later attacked Wollstonecraft personally for offering a 'direct vindication of adultery' in her posthumous novel, *Maria; or, The Wrongs of Woman* (*Strictures*, 48).

Negative representations of the female philosopher, particularly towards the end of the eighteenth century, reveal an underlying anxiety that the figure disturbs these 'limits prescribed to her sex'. In other words, the female philosopher shifted women from the private sphere of domesticity, increasingly viewed as their proper place, into the public sphere of political action. That these concerns, aired as often by women as men, were made in print, in the public sphere of literary production, shows the extent to which the female philosopher reveals the ideological investments in the divides between private sphere and public spheres of literary production and political action. Responding to Wollstonecraft's death, Mary Robinson, describing herself as 'avowedly of the same school [as Wollstonecraft]', categorised the female philosopher as 'that literary bugbear': an insight which highlights the figure's representational position within early feminist attacks on the public sphere.³²

30 [Sophia, Lady Burrell], *Adeline de Courcy*, vol. 1 of 2. (London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1797), 184. The image of a 'disputant in petticoats' is repeated in Horace Walpole's gibe at Wollstonecraft as a 'hyena in petticoats', and also finds an echo in an earlier novel, Maria Susanna Cooper, *The Exemplary Mother; or, Letters between Mrs Villars and Her Family*, vol. 1 of 2 (London: T. Becket, 1784), in which a character exclaims: 'A female philosopher! Defend us from petticoat innovators!', 98.

31 Hannah More, *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*, vol. 1 of 2. (London: T. Cadell, Jun. and W. Davies, 1799), 7. Subsequent references, in-text as *Strictures*.

32 Mary Robinson, *A Letter to the Women of England* (1799), with *The Natural Daughter* (1799), ed. Sharon M. Setzer (Peterborough: Broadview, 2003), 41, 58. See my 'Wollstonecraft's Legion: Feminism in Crisis, 1799' *Women's Writing* 20:4 (November 2013), 479–95, for a more detailed analysis of Robinson's engagement with the female philosopher, in comparison to Hannah More, Mary Hays and Priscilla Wakefield.

Literary production versus political action

Feminist critiques of women's exclusion from the public sphere of political action, undertaken by female philosophers both in and out of fiction, are staged from the literary public sphere. The female philosopher, therefore, has a complex relationship with the figure of the female reader, who haunts eighteenth-century fiction from at least Charlotte Lennox's *The Female Quixote* onwards. However, with the female philosopher, focus shifts from the novels and romances which bewilder and inspire Arabella to eighteenth-century, and particularly revolutionary, philosophy. On the other hand, 'philosophy' in this sense, within fiction, has a particularly representational quality, stressing the fictive nature of these debates, often in deliberately metafictional mode. Throughout *Wollstonecraft's Ghost*, I use Jürgen Habermas's splitting of the literary and political public spheres in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* to think about women writer's figurative strategies towards encouraging political reform. Habermas stages a division between the literary and political, arguing that the practice of reading in the private sphere extends into a public sphere of literary production, leading to the creation of a public sphere of political action. Habermas's theory has been challenged and developed by feminist critics, concerned that his public sphere excludes women, the working class, slaves and other marginalised groups.³³ Habermas addresses these concerns explicitly within his *Structural Transformation*, however, already problematising the terms of the debate. He grounds his analysis in the developments in reading throughout the century. Habermas's conception of the public sphere as 'a forum in which the private people, come together to form a public, readied themselves to compel public authority to legitimate itself before public opinion'³⁴ is 'guided specifically by such private experiences as grew out of the audience-oriented ... subjectivity of the conjugal family's intimate domain' (*Structural Transformation*, 28). Moreover, he unites the public with the private sphere through the practice of reading. Habermas's 'stratum of "bourgeois"' including jurists, doctors, pastors, officers, professors, scholars, school teachers and scribes – professionals forming the abstract idea of 'people', was, he argues, 'the real carrier of the public,

33 The critical corpus attacking, emending and reworking Habermas's seminal work on the eighteenth-century public sphere is immense. Eger et al., *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001) offer a perceptive introduction to these debates followed by a series of essays engaging with this fraught arena. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*, eds. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007) offers another series of interventions into the analysis of Habermas's ideas, particularly the two concluding essays, John Robertson, 'Women and Enlightenment: A Historiographical Conclusion', 692–704, and Kate Soper, 'Feminism and Enlightenment Legacies', 705–15. Both argue that Habermas's original thesis has been developed almost beyond recognition by its expansion to include women, slaves and working-class society.

34 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (1989) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), 25–6. Subsequent references in-text.

which from the outset was a reading public' (23). The reading material of this bourgeois public sphere – letters, diaries and first person narratives, leading up to *the* eighteenth-century genre, the novel – 'were experiments in subjectivity discovered in the close relationships of the conjugal family' (49). Further, this experimental subjectivity, 'as the innermost core of the private, was always already oriented to an audience' (49). In other words, the self-conscious subjectivity of the private individual forms itself with reference to others: family members, readers, the literary public sphere. This literary public sphere then develops into Habermas's public sphere of political action.

However, Habermas goes on to trouble each of these terms. The 'private autonomy' of market capitalism is transformed into patriarchal authority in the conjugal family, making 'any pretended freedom of individuals illusory' (47). Habermas singles out eighteenth-century marital law as particularly troublesome, characterising the marriage contract as 'largely a fiction'; a fiction, moreover, which drove novelistic representations of marriage as a site of conflict between reason and passion. Another problem with the Habermasian family's liminal position between private and public spheres was 'the conjugal family's self-image of its intimate sphere' which 'collided even within the consciousness of the bourgeoisie itself with the real functions of the bourgeois family': the reproduction of capital through inheritance. Habermas sees the origins of capitalist ideology in eighteenth-century equations of 'property owner' with 'human being as such', and literary with political public sphere, 'and also in public opinion itself, in which the interest of the class, via critical public debate, could assume the appearance of the general interest, that is, in the identification of domination with its dissolution into pure reason' (88). Adding 'gender' to 'class' in the preceding passage further illuminates the reasons Habermas has been both appropriated and criticised by feminist historians and literary critics: public opinion, reason itself, and therefore power – 'domination' – are placed into the hands of bourgeois men, figured as 'the general interest'.³⁵ Often accused of excluding women from his conception of the eighteenth-century public sphere, Habermas actually argues that women were debarred from the public sphere of political action whilst given access to the public sphere of literary production. Further, by an ideological *trompe-l'oeil*, 'in the self-understanding of public opinion the public sphere appeared as one and indivisible' (56).

Women writers, in particular, therefore found themselves in a Habermasian double bind during the eighteenth century. Allowed access to the public sphere of literary production, especially novels, women were denied access to the public sphere of political action. Female interjections in political, social and religious arguments in print therefore led to growing male anxiety over

35 See, for example, *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse*, ed. Johanna Meehan (New York: Routledge, 1993), especially Joan B. Landes, 'The Public and the Private Sphere: A Feminist Reconsideration', 91–116, which both seeks to feminise Habermas's public sphere and probe the model's resistance to such activity.

women's access to the public sphere of political action. As these separate spheres were viewed as unitary, women's writing on political issues threatened to reveal the ideological investments in this faultline between the literary and political. Combining Habermas's focus on 'class' with a feminist concern for 'gender', then, reveals the eighteenth-century male bourgeoisie's occupation of neutrality and rationality which comes under attack in the 1790s by revolutionary feminists like Hays and Robinson, and most spectacularly by Wollstonecraft. I argue that women writers, inspired by Wollstonecraft, created a space for themselves on the faultline between literary production and political action, exploiting this position to broaden the scope of women's role in the private sphere – already an implicitly political – public – act as the conservative press sought to narrow conceptions of women's domestic role.

Wollstonecraft both criticised stereotypical representations of the female reader in literature and contemporary criticism and challenged the related divisions between public and private spheres, particularly women's role within them. Women writers responding to Wollstonecraft also negotiated these conflicting representations and divisions. Moreover, I argue that their response often took place on a metatextual level, including in their narrative figures of female readers reading texts by Wollstonecraft, other female philosophers and radical writers. For example, Wollstonecraft inveighs against 'the reveries of the stupid novelists, who, knowing little of human nature, work up strange tales, and describe meretricious scenes, all retailed in a sentimental jargon, which equally tend to corrupt the taste, and draw the heart aside from its daily duties'.³⁶ Jane Austen seems to respond directly to Wollstonecraft's condemnation of stupid novelists in her defence of novel writing and reading in *Northanger Abbey*, published posthumously in 1818 but first conceived in the late 1790s. Imagining a conventional novelistic heroine, 'who, if she accidentally take up a novel, is sure to turn over its insipid pages with disgust', dismissing her reading as 'only a novel!',³⁷ Austen retorts:

'It is only Cecilia, or Camilla, or Belinda;' or, in short, only some work in which the greatest powers of the mind are displayed, in which the most thorough knowledge of human nature, the happiest delineation of its varieties, the liveliest effusions of wit and humour are conveyed to the world in the best chosen language.

(*Northanger Abbey*, 31)

Austen replaces Wollstonecraft's condemnation of 'the reveries of the stupid novelists' with a celebration of the novel as a vehicle for displaying 'the greatest

36 Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 256.

37 Jane Austen, *Northanger Abbey* (1818), eds. Barbara M. Benedict and Deirdre Le Faye. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 2. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 30. Subsequent references, in-text.

powers of the mind'. Wollstonecraft's assertion that novelists know 'little of human nature' is contradicted by Austen's claim that novels show 'the most thorough knowledge of human nature'. Finally, Wollstonecraft's accusation of 'sentimental jargon' is challenged by Austen's 'best chosen language'. If Austen is deliberately echoing Wollstonecraft here, then her silence on the novel's effect on the performance of women's 'daily duties' hints at Austen's more confident portrayal of reading as symbolic of women's position between private and public sphere, analysed in further detail in my discussion of *Mansfield Park* (see Chapter 3).

Critics such as Eve Tavor Bannet, Elizabeth Eger and Patricia McKee³⁸ have focused on women's situation between private and public sphere in the eighteenth century, with more or less focus on female readers and reading. Pearson and Fergus both discuss anxieties surrounding the figure of the female reader. Fergus postulates that 'Implicit here [in these anxieties] is a fear of female fantasy or sexual stimulation, crystallising in the prevalent male fantasy that women who read novels will reject ordinary men who love them, cherishing instead a romantic daydream'.³⁹ Pearson argues that 'Female reading figures both solitary and selfish pleasure and rationality and self-suppression; as such it reveals the contradictions in contemporary gender-ideologies'.⁴⁰ Building on these important insights, I show that by shifting focus from female readers to the more narrowly defined female philosopher, women writers in the early nineteenth century sought to make their literary representations of thinking women explicitly political: foregrounding the need for improved education for women, and a concomitant extension of their role in the public sphere, of national importance in their post-revolutionary context.

The female reader shared a similar trajectory to the female philosopher through the eighteenth and into the early nineteenth centuries. She began as an equivocal celebration of the development of female literacy over the course of the century, leavened with anxieties over the effects of reading on the imagination, particularly the autonomous expression of female desire. These concerns about the female reader clustered around her reading of the novel, often figured as a particularly feminine genre. In 1752, Charlotte Lennox published *The*

38 See Eve Tavor Bannet, *The Domestic Revolution* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000) for her account of the role of women writers in shaping the discourses of domesticity in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century; although I would argue that her division of women into 'Egalitarians' and 'Matriarchs', 3–4, perpetuates rather than challenges existing categorisations of women into revolutionary and counter-revolutionary camps. Patricia McKee, *Public & Private: Gender, Class and the British Novel (1764–1878)* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997) explores the dichotomy between private life and public knowledge from the mid-eighteenth to the late-nineteenth century.

39 See Jan Fergus, 'Women Readers: A Case Study' in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700–1800*, ed. Vivien Jones (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 155–76, 173.

40 See Jacqueline Pearson, *Women's Reading in Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 16.

Female Quixote, the heroine of which misreads novels and romances as reality, as the Spanish Don had interpreted the world through outdated works of chivalry. Throughout the eighteenth century, and in the 1790s in particular, female reading was represented as a dangerous activity, both for female readers themselves and for their wider social situation. The term ‘female quixote’, which Lennox applies to her heroine, links the figures of the female reader and the female philosopher, both expressing concerns that women’s reading will lead them astray, socially and sexually. In the 1790s, as women’s reading increasingly included works of radical philosophy, the female quixote became submerged within the female philosopher figure, particularly her counter-revolutionary caricature. Gary Kelly situates the transgressive characters of Bridgetina Botherim and Julia Delmond in Elizabeth Hamilton’s *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, discussed in Chapter 2, as female quixotes, although I argue that it is Bridgetina and Julia’s reading of philosophical tracts which leads them astray rather than novels alone, linking them with the more current term female philosopher above female quixote.⁴¹ Joe Bray further questions the applicability of the term ‘female quixote’ to female readers in women’s writing of the Romantic period, arguing that the female reader in the early nineteenth century was often more active and self-correcting than the image of the passive, unquestioning, thoughtless female reader in earlier works and later criticism.⁴² Bray’s repositioning of the female reader as a textual role model within women’s writing engages with the more positive representations of the female philosopher figure in her Enlightenment or radical iterations. I argue that the female reader, like the female philosopher, and indeed representations of Wollstonecraft herself, was split between contested iterations in women’s writing of the period. It is through the process of working through these divided representations, sometimes by favouring one over the other, sometimes by creating a new female character who transcends these divisions, that women writers of the Romantic period forged new understandings of women’s role in private and public spheres.

In the 1790s, the discourse surrounding female reading and readers became radicalised by the debate about the effects of the French Revolution in Britain, often combining with the parallel representation of the female philosopher. Reading was figured as both a potentially revolutionary act, liberating female expression, and as a patriotic activity, inculcating domestic duties and civic responsiveness. Jon P. Klancher situates the 1790s as a turning point in the history of reading as an explicitly political activity, although his landmark *The Making of English Reading Audiences* does not focus on the role of female readers in the new public spheres of the early nineteenth

41 See Gary Kelly, *Women, Writing and Revolution 1790–1827* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 144–9, for his analysis of Hamilton’s novel and her use of the female reader in it.

42 See Joe Bray, *The Female Reader in the English Novel* (New York: Routledge, 2009) for his analysis of the role of the intradiegetic reader, or the reader within the narrative, in women’s writing of the Romantic period.

century.⁴³ Female reading was a key term, however, within the radical, middle-class and coterie groups Klancher studies, and Wollstonecraft functioned as a nucleus around which responses to female readers cluster, combined with her reception as a female philosopher.

Wollstonecraft's Ghost traces the developing significance of female readers and reading in texts responding to Wollstonecraft's life and work, as well as working as a reception study of Wollstonecraft herself. Each chapter explores how an author or group of authors read Wollstonecraft's biography and writing; how this is figured within the text through the inclusion of female readers, often conflated with the figure of the female philosopher; and how readers, especially the burgeoning audience of professional critics and reviewers, responded to the writers who engage with Wollstonecraft's posthumous legacy in the early nineteenth century. Several critics have studied the developments in the reception of key literary figures through the eighteenth century, including Michael Dobson on Shakespeare, Dustin Griffin on Milton, Claudia Thomas on Pope and Jane Spencer on Behn.⁴⁴ My argument engages with these reception studies by exploring women writers' relationships to Wollstonecraft's life and work in the early nineteenth century. My work on Wollstonecraft builds on Spencer's on Behn, particularly her insight that 'Women proved their respectability by showing how greatly they differed from Behn'⁴⁵ – a strikingly similar rhetorical strategy was used by several writers in their engagement with Wollstonecraft.

My first chapter intertwines Mary Hays and William Godwin's in some ways competing representations of Mary Wollstonecraft, hinging on their different interpretations of the combination of reason, passion and imagination in her character. Both writers draw on their private correspondence with Wollstonecraft to shape their public celebration of her as female philosopher. I begin by exploring Mary Hays's personal, professional and posthumous engagement with Wollstonecraft, her representation of her friend and mentor as the

43 Jon P. Klancher focuses on the interrelated and overlapping developments of radical, middle-class and coterie readers in *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790–1832* (Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987).

44 Michael Dobson, *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660–1769* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995) explores the reception of and revisions made to Shakespeare's plays from the Restoration into the eighteenth century, analysing the cultural factors which combined to cement Shakespeare's reputation as the British national poet. Dustin Griffin, *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009) argues against the anxiety of influence model of literary inheritance to position Milton's oeuvre as a rich resource for eighteenth-century poets. Claudia Thomas, *Alexander Pope and His Eighteenth-Century Women Readers* (Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994) uses reader-response criticism to analyse both how Pope addresses a female audience and how women writers responded to Pope, often surprisingly sympathetically, to develop their own perspectives on female education and women's role in society. Jane Spencer, *Aphra Behn's Afterlife* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) explores Behn's reception throughout the eighteenth century, analysing her influence on its literature.

45 See Jane Spencer, *Aphra Behn's Afterlife*, 12.

foremost female philosopher of the age before and after Wollstonecraft's death, and how she uses this to develop her own self-representation as a feminist. I go on to analyse how Godwin draws on his and Wollstonecraft's discussions about the importance of philosophy in private and public life, expressed passionately in their private correspondence, in order to develop firstly, a radical, Romanticised representation of his wife in biography and fiction; secondly, an evaluation of the links between Wollstonecraft's private personality and her public writing; and thirdly, a revised account of the importance of private relationships, what he terms the 'domestic affections', in his public philosophy of political justice. In his *Memoirs*, Godwin divides his representation of Wollstonecraft between a nightmarish vision of his late wife which he struggles to disavow and a Romantic version of her, celebrated as a paragon of sensibility. Later women writers draw on both Hays and Godwin's competing images of Wollstonecraft to split their own representations of the female philosopher into a Romanticised revisioning of Wollstonecraft and a nightmarish version, identifiable as a caricatured compression of Hays's philosophical engagement.

My second chapter traces these divided representations of the female philosopher through Opie's *Adeline Mowbray*, Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* and Edgeworth's *Belinda*. Both Opie and Hamilton are implicitly sympathetic to Wollstonecraft's feminist polemic, whilst harbouring doubts about the ability of her brand of radical politics to ameliorate the condition of women in society. I argue that, in succumbing to the standard trope of seduction followed by death in their representations of the female philosopher, Opie and Hamilton compromise their Wollstonecraftian social critique. In refusing to kill off Lady Delacour at the conclusion of *Belinda*, Edgeworth escapes from this cliché, opening out the possibility for at least a textual revolution in novel form. Each writer is engaged with a liberal weighing up of radical and conservative models of female behaviour, suggesting different ways out of what seems to be a personal and political deadlock.

My third chapter analyses the position of the female philosopher in two works of 1814, Burney's *The Wanderer* and Austen's *Mansfield Park*. Both works are anchored in debates from the 1790s, particularly on female education and the politics of the marriage market, but written and published in a post-revolutionary era unsympathetic to earlier radical arguments. Both novels are concerned with the need to resolve the urgent debates of the 1790s but painfully aware of the insufficiency of the counter-revolutionary solution of nationalist domesticity at an individual level. Whereas Burney's novel looks backwards to the 1790s, with the action of the novel set during Robespierre's Terror and including a pseudo-Wollstonecraftian caricature, Austen sublimates these arguments in her novel, divesting even her most Jacobinical characters, the Crawfords, of any overtly political content. Instead, I argue that Austen appropriates the radical analysis of the way in which women's subordination to men warps their personalities, popularised by Wollstonecraft, in her exploration of Fanny Price's character. Austen's engagement with Wollstonecraft is markedly less direct than those of the other writers I discuss, marking the farthest point away from

Wollstonecraft's influence, although I argue that *Mansfield Park* is still haunted by the spectres of competing representations of the female philosopher in the contrasting figures of Fanny Price and Mary Crawford. My fifth and final chapter, on the other hand, returns to the personal engagement with Wollstonecraft's legacy in Mary Shelley's writing.

In this concluding chapter, I trace the ways in which Mary Shelley takes the figure of the female philosopher from earlier writing and shapes her into new generic parameters popular in the literature of the 1820s and 1830s. I compare Mary Shelley's Gothic treatment of the female philosopher in *Frankenstein* with the earlier Female Gothic of Charlotte Dacre. I then contrast Mary Shelley's historicising of the female philosopher in her historical novels *Valperga* and *Perkin Warbeck*, with Walter Scott's treatment of his female characters in the early *Waverley* novels. My final chapter concludes with the impossible position of the female philosopher in the silver fork novel, using Mary Shelley's *Lodore* as a test case. From the 1790s to the 1830s, the female philosopher has evolved from an epithet of approbation to a reactionary bogeywoman, haunting women writers's self-representations and the development of their female characters. The female philosopher's influence on later representations of both the woman writer and her heroines can be glimpsed as a subtext running through the later nineteenth century, from Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre* into the Victorian period and beyond. Haunting both these later representations and the novels I discuss in what follows is the ghost of Wollstonecraft herself.

1 Imagining Mary

Representations of Wollstonecraft in the works of Mary Hays and William Godwin

Both Mary Hays and William Godwin present very personal portraits of Mary Wollstonecraft which were, and still are, highly influential in later representations of her life and thought. Moreover, their representations of Wollstonecraft – as friend, thinker, lover – proved to be revolutionary to their own self-representations. For Hays, Wollstonecraft provided a model for how to be a woman writer; a model which she would try to live up to and celebrate in print. For Godwin, his love affair with Wollstonecraft would accelerate developments within his political philosophy, particularly a renewed emphasis on the domestic affections. Although, as Mark Philp argues,¹ Godwin may have been moving towards a reconceptualisation of the position of the private sphere in his political philosophy before his relationship with Wollstonecraft, his biography of his late wife crystallised these ideas into a precise argument which he would repeat in his novel *St. Leon* and his defence of his philosophy, *Reply to Dr. Parr*. For both writers, the nexus between representation and self-representation was the imagination, conceived as a bridge between reason and passion.

Godwin and Hays's focus on Wollstonecraft's imagination, and its effect on their own creative selves, forms part of a shift in the 1790s from Enlightenment models of subjectivity towards a Romantic understanding of the self. In *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination*, Barbara Taylor argues against what she sees as a later romanticising of Wollstonecraft's career, shifting emphasis back onto the eighteenth-century underpinnings of her thought, especially Dissenting religious practice.² While I am sympathetic towards Taylor's excellent exegesis of Wollstonecraft's complex engagement with religion in her life and writing, my focus on Wollstonecraft's posthumous reception stresses the significance of Romantic rereadings of her work, which tend to stress her imaginative power and creative potential. The roots of this Romantic

1 See Mark Philp, *Godwin's Political Justice* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986), for his argument that Godwin's views on the domestic affections changed independently from his relationship with Wollstonecraft.

2 See Barbara Taylor, *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 282, for her footnoted dismissal of Wollstonecraft as Romantic figure.

idealisation of Wollstonecraft can be found in Hays and Godwin's original formulations of her personality.

Situated on faultlines between Enlightenment and Romanticism, private and public, reason and passion, Hays and Godwin's representations of Wollstonecraft are themselves liable to fracture. By splitting Wollstonecraft 'between her amazonian-critical-rational and feminine-imaginative-emotional representations'³, as Nicola Trott argues, Godwin's *Memoirs* allowed *Anti-Jacobin* commentators to further feminise Wollstonecraft, coupling the details of her private life with an already existing misogynistic discourse of the prostitute in order to defuse her radical critique of the contemporary treatment of women. This split both taps into and borrows from the deepening division between the idealised Enlightenment representation of the female philosopher and her nightmarish, counter-revolutionary double, using Godwin's candid revelations to fuel reactionary abuse of the couple's life and work. On the other hand, and more positively, Godwin's divided representation of Wollstonecraft in his *Memoirs* also allowed women writers sympathetic to her feminist thought to draw on this split to separate Godwin's feminine ideal of Wollstonecraft from the counter-revolutionary iteration of the female philosopher, together with aspects of her political philosophy which they wished to develop in the post-revolutionary era. I argue that these later divided representations of the female philosopher caricature Mary Hays's self-representation as a thinking woman to 'rescue' Wollstonecraft from the counter-revolutionary opprobrium visited upon the publication of Godwin's *Memoirs*. These fractured versions of the female philosopher – at once terrifyingly unwomanly and rich in creative potential – feed into the later vilifications and idealisations of the feminist today.

In this chapter, I draw on the private correspondence between Wollstonecraft, Hays and Godwin to demonstrate the extent to which both writers were attempting to publicise their personal understanding of this complex woman. Hays's representation of Wollstonecraft inspires her own distinctive brand of feminist philosophy, often subordinated under Godwin and Wollstonecraft's influence in contemporary and modern criticism. Moreover, her vision of Wollstonecraft as the foremost female philosopher of the day informs both her own self-representation as a feminist, and later revisions of Wollstonecraft's influential arguments. Godwin's sometimes ambiguous celebration of his late wife offers a divided representation of Wollstonecraft to both *Anti-Jacobin* detractors of the couple's revolutionary philosophy, eager to besmirch the reputation of both, and more positively, a model for later women writers to separate out Wollstonecraft's troubling reputation from her inspiring arguments. In this chapter, I trace Wollstonecraft's influence on Mary Hays from her early *Letters and Essays*, which drew on her professional correspondence with Wollstonecraft to formulate a distinctive feminist stance on contemporary issues; to their

3 Nicola Trott, 'Sexing the Critic: Mary Wollstonecraft at the Turn of the Century' in *1798: The Year of the Lyrical Ballads*, ed. Richard Cronin (London: Macmillan, 1998), 54.

fictionalisation in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*; before intertwining Hays's memorialisation of Wollstonecraft with Godwin's biography of his wife, together with his own fictionalisation of her in *St. Leon's* Marguerite de Damville.

**'The rights of woman and the name of Wollstonecraft':
*Letters and Essays***

In August 1792, Hays began her correspondence with Wollstonecraft with what amounts to a fan letter, praising the latter's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* and her 'spirited support of the just and natural rights of her sex'.⁴ Kelly explains how Hays, after reading Wollstonecraft's second *Vindication*, 'felt it to be a personally revolutionary text' (*Women, Writing and Revolution*, 80). This not only explains Hays's gushing tone in her letter, but how Hays would later interpret Wollstonecraft's life and thought throughout her own published oeuvre: Wollstonecraft's revolution became Hays's personal passion.

After meeting Wollstonecraft at Joseph Johnson's house, Hays described Wollstonecraft as possessing 'the sort of genius which Lavater calls the one in ten million. Her conversation, like her writings, is brilliant, forcible, instructive and entertaining. She is a true disciple of her own system, and commands at once fear and reverence, admiration and esteem' (*Collected Letters*, 209, fn). Gina Luria Walker singles out Hays's representation of Wollstonecraft as a genius as a seminal moment in Hays's own self-presentation: from this point on, Hays would strive to occupy the role of Wollstonecraft's 'true disciple'. Hays's realisation of Wollstonecraft's singular nature also had ramifications for the image she later constructed of her friend and mentor for posterity. In contrast, however, to Hays's enthusiasm for Wollstonecraft's genius, conversation and writings, Wollstonecraft adopted a distinctly chilly demeanour towards Hays and her literary endeavours in her critique of the Wollstonecraftian *Letters and Essays*.

Wollstonecraft undertakes a detailed critique of Hays's self-presentation in her preface. Mary A. Waters notes that Wollstonecraft eschews advising Hays on the content of her work but comments on exactly 'how she should present herself to the reading public – how, in other words, to market herself effectively as a new author'.⁵ Wollstonecraft criticises Hays's obsequiousness, her false humility and her reliance on male mentors. She firstly pinpoints Hays's obsequy, overemphasising 'the *honour* of publishing' which is, in Wollstonecraft's view, 'the cant of both trade and sex' (*Collected Letters*, 209), instead stressing the need for equality over servility in relations between employer and employed. Wollstonecraft takes issue with a character trait here, which several

4 *The Collected Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd (London: Penguin, 2004), 202, fn. Subsequent references, in-text.

5 Mary A. Waters, "'The First of a New Genus": Mary Wollstonecraft as a Literary Critic and Mentor to Mary Hays' *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37.3 (2004), 415–34, 424. Subsequent references, in-text.

of Hays's male mentors, including Robert Robinson and William Godwin, had also lamented.⁶

Next, Wollstonecraft warns Hays that she is 'going to treat you with still greater frankness – I do not approve of your preface and I will tell you why' (*Collected Letters*, 209). Wollstonecraft prepares Hays for harsh but useful criticism. She scolds Hays for pleading 'Disadvantages of education' telling her that 'if the writer has not sufficient strength of mind to overcome the common difficulties which lie in his way, nature seems to command him, with a very audible voice, to leave the task of instructing others to those who can' (209). Waters comments briefly on the 'use of masculine pronouns' throughout this passage, which, she argues, highlights 'the assumption that ordinarily authors, especially authors of expository prose, were male' ('The First of a New Genus', 424). I contend, however, that Wollstonecraft's use of masculine pronouns in a letter between two women writers both highlights Wollstonecraft's challenge to eighteenth-century gender norms and encourages Hays to have the 'sufficient strength' to publish, and stand, on her own merits.

Wollstonecraft's final paragraph criticises Hays for including in her preface private words of encouragement from her male friends, declaring that these friends will 'still treat you like a woman', that is, with condescending acclaim in private which 'they would be sorry openly to avow without some cooling explanatory ifs'. Wollstonecraft concludes her letter with both encouragement and warning:

In short, it requires great resolution to try rather to be useful than to please ...
– Rest, on yourself – if your essays have merit they will stand alone, if not the
shouldering up of Dr this or that will not long keep them from falling to the
ground.

(*Collected Letters*, 210, original emphasis)

Wollstonecraft holds out the possibility of Hays's usefulness as a writer but demands that Hays stands on her own merit, without male support. Waters concludes her own analysis of Wollstonecraft's suggestive letter by returning to this issue of self-presentation:

Her advice to this new author concludes as it began with attention not to literary or even political issues, but with guidance on self-presentation: 'till a work strongly interests the public true modesty should keep the author in the background.' We need hardly remark that although her implied author started out male, it is an especially feminine virtue – modesty – that spurs a writer to place the work before the self.

(424)

6 Walker cites Robinson's refusal to accept Hays's excessive flattery in a letter of March 1785: 'First, give me leave to tell you, yea to threaten you, that if you do not leave off complimenting me, as soon as I can write, I will spoil a quire of paper, and stretch every power I have to try and out compliment you' (*Growth of a Woman's Mind*, 39).

Resting on yourself, for Wollstonecraft, does not mean putting yourself forward, but presenting your material assertively, remaining authorially modest or neutral. In the *Vindication*, Wollstonecraft devotes a chapter to ‘Modesty – Comprehensively Considered, and Not as a Sexual Virtue’ in which she distinguishes between humility and modesty: ‘Modesty ... is that soberness of mind which teaches a man not to think more highly of himself than he ought to think, and should be distinguished from humility, because humility is a kind of self-abasement’.⁷ Wollstonecraft’s distinction between humility and modesty, rather than revealing her confused gender constructions, as Waters seems to suggest, instead illuminates her attempt to co-opt the language of neutrality – understood as a male-dominated edifice – for women writers such as herself and Hays. Wollstonecraft claims modesty as an important attribute of the philosopher, arguing that ‘I have ... philosophically pursued these reflections till I inferred that those women who have most improved their reason must have the most modesty’ (*Vindication*, 193). Wollstonecraft’s philosophical pursuit, here, is deliberately gendered neutral, even when considering ‘women who have most improved their reason’. Both modesty and philosophy, in Wollstonecraft’s terms, are gender-neutral, available to both men and women.

In response to Wollstonecraft’s comments, Hays redrafted her original preface so that the published version quotes Wollstonecraft’s argument that ‘as society is at present constituted, the little knowledge, which even women of stronger minds attain, is of too desultory a nature, and pursued in too secondary a manner to give vigour to the faculties, or clearness to the judgement’.⁸ Hays has ingeniously responded to Wollstonecraft’s criticism of pleading ‘Disadvantages of education’ in her preface by quoting from Wollstonecraft’s own analysis of the disadvantages of women’s education. Hays specifies that this will be the ‘only apology’ she will make to her ‘critical reader’, a reader who is assumed to be male, but also includes Wollstonecraft herself.

In her revised preface, Hays replaces her catalogue of approving male mentors, criticised by Wollstonecraft in her letter, with a single female mentor: Wollstonecraft. Hays first praises Wollstonecraft’s arguments in her *Vindication*: women’s rights are ‘founded in nature, reason, and justice, though so long degraded and sunk in frivolity and voluptuous refinement’. She then turns to her own project in *Letters and Essays*, a collection of opinion pieces about women’s position in society which seeks to inculcate ‘genuine virtue’ and ‘purity of heart’ by encouraging the pursuit of ‘knowledge and reflection’ in accordance with Wollstonecraft’s own recommendations (*Letters and Essays*, vi). In this work Hays begins to employ Wollstonecraft’s ideas to explore how reason and feeling could combine to formulate her own brand of feminist philosophy.

7 Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792) *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 191. Subsequent references, in-text.

8 Mary Hays, *Letters and Essays, Moral and Miscellaneous* (London: Knott, 1793), vi. Subsequent references, in-text.

Letters and Essays encourages this pursuit of knowledge by discussing an intellectually ambitious range of philosophical, metaphysical and theological issues in a personal, epistolary style. Wollstonecraft returns throughout the text as a touchstone for Hays's own feminism – a starting point from which Hays develops her own idiosyncratic views on women's rights, their education, and potential for social relationships both in marriage and in the world of work. Rather than being a mere imitator of Wollstonecraft, then, Hays brings Wollstonecraft's feminist arguments to bear on her own independent ideas, creatively using her friend's writing to develop her own engagement with feminism, stressing the central role of the emotions in the maturation of the intellect. For example, in Letter VIII, Hays invents the romance of Henrietta and Edwin to illustrate her defence of reading novels in the previous letter. Like Hays's later heroine Emma Courtney, Henrietta sighs 'to become the heroine of a romance, and vainly sought to find a lover, and a friend resembling the portraits coloured by her vivid imagination' (105). Having Henrietta fall in love at first sight with Edwin, Hays curiously deploys an extract from Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* to underscore the noble innocence of their love affair:

Suppose a young person in the first ardor of affection deifies the beloved object! What harm can arise from this mistaken enthusiastic attachment? Perhaps it is necessary for virtue first to appear in a human form, to impress youthful hearts; the ideal model, which a more matured and exalted mind looks up to, and shapes for itself, would elude their sight ...
(106)⁹

Hays uses Wollstonecraft, here as elsewhere, to defend her own argument that passion leads to a rational engagement with the divine. Hays stresses the fundamental importance of the passions throughout her writing much more than Wollstonecraft does in hers, but excerpts well-chosen passages from the *Vindication* to bolster her own views with those of her more famous counterpart.

Contemporary reviews noted the link between Hays's writing and Wollstonecraft's famous *Vindication*. Although Johnson chose not to publish Hays's miscellany, possibly because of Wollstonecraft's lukewarm response to it (discussed above), his periodical the *Analytical Review* commented favourably on it in 1793. The reviewer, identified by the initials D.M., commends Hays, connecting her work with Wollstonecraft's by arguing that 'The rights of woman, which have been of late so ably asserted by an enlightened female philosopher, have been very successfully exercised by the writer of these pages'.¹⁰ Walker notes that this review 'was the first to identify [*Letters and Essays*] as a woman-centred work', (*Growth of a Woman's Mind*, 74). More conservative reviewers

9 Hays takes her quotation from chapter V of Wollstonecraft's *Vindication*, 177.

10 D.M., Rev. of *Letters and Essays*, by Mary Hays, *The Analytical Review; or, History of Literature, Domestic and Foreign* 16 (May–August 1793) (London: Joseph Johnson, 1793), 464.

attacked Hays and her work for exactly the same reasons. In the *English Review*'s venomous assessment, also 1793, Hays 'stands forward one of the boldest beneath the standard of Mary Wollstonecraft'.¹¹ With a foretaste of the malice meted out to *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*, the reviewer concludes:

we have been sedulous to bring forward into full view every female politician and philosopher that meet us in the paths of literature; since to render these characters conspicuous, is, generally speaking, to expose them to the contempt and ridicule which they deserve, by detecting their affectations, their vanities, and their follies.

(*The English Review*, 256)

As I discuss in my introduction, by the early 1790s 'female philosopher' was already a contested term: a liberal reviewer could commend Hays's advancement of enlightened female philosophy at the same time as a conservative lambasted Hays for her affection, vanity and folly, for her hubris as a woman engaging in the 'masculine' discourses of philosophy, metaphysics and theology: 'We despise dogmas that originate in affected wisdom – we are disgusted by flippancy and frivolousness that betray all the conceit of an half-educated female' (*The English Review*, 255). The *English Review* questions the basis of Hays's ability to address her audience, her 'affected wisdom' leads to dogma rather than knowledge or understanding, and attacks her necessary autodidacticism, reducing her to a flippant and frivolous 'half-educated' woman. 'Female philosophy', in this reactionary view, is an oxymoron: a woman's wisdom can only ever be 'affected'. This attack on women's wisdom explains both Wollstonecraft and Hays's scepticism about the term 'female philosopher', and the significance of Wollstonecraft claiming the language of neutrality for women.

Letters and Essays shows both Wollstonecraft's influence on Hays's self-representation as a woman writer, and that this connection was made by both her supporters in liberal, dissenting circles and conservative antagonists to Hays's revolutionary rhetoric. What these reviews both miss, however, is the extent to which Hays uses Wollstonecraft's philosophical arguments to develop her own individual perspective, particularly on the role of the passions in the development of reason. This focus is developed in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* and becomes one of the touchstones in her representation of Wollstonecraft in her later memoir and obituary.

'Neither a philosopher, nor a heroine': *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*

Hays uses the epistolary form in *Letters and Essays* firstly to present her sometimes controversial philosophical discussions in an engaging style and

11 Rev. of *Letters and Essays*, by Mary Hays, *The English Review; or, An Abstract of English and Foreign Literature* 22 (London: Murray, 1793), 253.

secondly to frame her fictional accounts of idealised relationships. In *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*, Emma's memoirs are themselves framed by letters to her adopted son Augustus Junior, explaining their didactic purpose of serving as a warning both to him and to Hays's reading public, and connected together by letters exchanged between Emma, her love object Augustus Harley (senior) and her confidant Mr Francis. In spite of Hays's explicit aim of representing Emma's 'hazardous experiment [as] calculated to operate as a *warning*, rather than as an example',¹² Hays's own hazardous experiment refuses to settle on this cautionary objective, always returning to a radically unresolved reading of its own didactic purpose.

Memoirs of Emma Courtney is Hays's most discussed work, both at the time and in subsequent criticism. Marilyn Butler argues that it 'attracted more remonstrance than any other individual revolutionary novel'.¹³ I discuss some of these contemporary responses at the end of this section. Modern critical debate on the novel focuses on Hays's use of autobiography to shape her fiction, the revolutionary consequences of her feminist arguments, and the relationships of both text and author to Godwin, Wollstonecraft, and other writers' lives and works. Tilottama Rajan unravels Hays's commingling of autobiography and fiction in her exemplary chapter 'Autonarration and Genotext in Mary Hays's *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*', arguing that the movement between life and text is more complex and ambiguous than the straightforwardly confessional mode for which it often gets mistaken.¹⁴ Eleanor Ty situates *Emma Courtney* as a subversive rereading of female intellectual and sexual desire, privileging the position of the passions in human consciousness in her chapter on Hays in *Unsex'd Revolutionaries*.¹⁵ Gary Kelly argues that Hays 'feminizes Godwin's novel form', by combining it with Thomas Holcroft's more feminine epistolary style, thus 'masculiniz[ing] Holcroft's', in order 'to construct her own, Revolutionary feminist version of the English Jacobin novel, or "philosophical romance"' (*Women, Writing and Revolution*, 105). Kelly points out that by making a female philosopher her protagonist, Hays 'went beyond Godwin and Holcroft, and [was] doubly scandalous in relation to the gendering of discourse and culture' (105). By exploring how Hays deploys Wollstonecraftian arguments to critique Godwin's philosophical blindness to the plight of women, I focus on Hays's development of her own imaginative philosophy, involving a more ambiguous position towards the female philosopher in the novel.

12 Mary Hays, *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), ed. Marilyn L. Brooks (Aldershot: Broadview, 2000), 36. Subsequent references, in-text.

13 Marilyn Butler, *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 117.

14 Tilottama Rajan, 'Autonarration and Genotext in Mary Hays's *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*' in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*, eds. Rajan and Julia Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 213–39.

15 See Eleanor Ty, *Unsex'd Revolutionaries: Five Women Novelists of the 1790s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 1993, 46–59 for her chapter on Hays.

This ambiguity begins, as Kelly argues, with the novel's framing device which 'presents a split in "feeling and thinking" ... with two letters from the narrator-heroine showing her as woman of feeling one moment, "philosopher" the next' (96). Further consideration makes it clear that Emma's two letters enact a tripartite movement from presenting herself as a woman of feeling to adopting a distancing philosophical tone to finally questioning the usefulness of 'abstract' philosophy in negotiating the trials and tribulations of existence. In other words, the split between 'thinking and feeling' that Kelly diagnoses is healed by Hays's revolutionary combination of thinking and feeling in her feminist philosophy. Hays's ambivalent relationship to 'female' philosophy is apparent here: she wants to both eschew and embrace the term in relation to herself, taking a philosophical position to critique the consolations offered by contemporary philosophers, such as Godwin. In doing so, she contrasts her own feminist philosophy, which traces the connections between feeling and reason, to Godwin's brand of philosophy, which she depicts as stressing rationality over emotional engagement.

Emma's philosophical letter introduces the major preoccupation with balancing reason and passion that governs the rest of her memoirs:

Rouse the nobler energies of your mind; be not the slave of your passions, neither dream of eradicating them. Sensation generates interest, interest passion, passion forces attention, attention supplies the powers, and affords the means of attaining its end: in proportion to the degree of interest, will be that of attention and power. Thus are talents produced.

(*Emma Courtney*, 42)

Augustus's 'nobler energies' of mind balance his intellect with his emotions. Patricia Meyer Spacks analyses the use of the term 'energies of mind' in the plots of 1790s novels, arguing that the use of the term 'dramatizes the developing ideology of harmony – between reason and feeling, between power and reconciliation, between socially constructed versions of "masculine" and "feminine" – implicit ... in the novelistic celebration of "energy of mind"'.¹⁶ Although Spacks does not discuss Hays's novel, *Emma Courtney* is profoundly involved in this search for equilibrium. Hays roots her philosophy in the sensations, showing how passionate feeling leads to intellectual power. This interrelationship of reason and passion is central to Emma's, and Hays's, female philosophy.

The exchange of letters between Emma and Mr Francis, particularly the three crucial letters at its centre, are key to the text, as they comment, in a revolutionarily metafictional way, on the preceding action of *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* itself. Other critics have also focused on this exchange; for example, Kelly states that it 'completes the novel's statement of Hays's Revolutionary feminism', arguing that it differentiates her feminism from Wollstonecraft's as it emphasises

16 Patricia Meyer Spacks, 'Energies of Mind: Plot's Possibilities in the 1790s' *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 1.1 (October 1988), 37–52, 51.

erotic and intellectual equality over professional and civic potential (*Women, Writing and Revolution*, 102). However, the exchange is even more inter-textually complex than this; Hays mobilises Wollstonecraftian feminism to develop her own political philosophy and to confront Godwin's with its failings in relation to women's situation in society.

Disgusted with her dilatory lover Augustus Harley, and herself after discovering that he is already married to a woman he abhors, Emma writes that 'The Augustus I had so long and so tenderly loved, no longer seemed to exist' (*Emma Courtney*, 164), hinting at the almost imaginary quality of her love affair and foreshadowing the diminution of his importance in the novel. She then pours out her heart to the kindly philosopher Mr Francis in what I see as the central exchange of the novel. It is in this section that Hays engages directly with Godwin's literary criticism of her novel so far, structuring her use of actual letters between her and Godwin in order to expose the limitations of Godwinian political philosophy in explaining or ameliorating women's position in society. In response to this criticism, Hays articulates through Emma her individual development of Revolutionary feminism. I argue that this exchange of letters brings into sharp focus Hays's sophisticated use of autobiographical material in order to shape her philosophical arguments, modelling the balance of reason and passion she and her protagonist Emma strive for elsewhere.

Emma begins her letter by reminding Francis that 'You once told me, I was incapable of heroism; and you were right' (166). This echoes Emma's earlier statement to herself: 'I feel, that I am neither a philosopher, nor a heroine, but a woman, to whom education has given a sexual character' (149). Both of these statements are adapted from letters to Godwin. On 11 January 1796, Hays wrote: 'You think me incapable of heroism, I fear so, &, yet, I am call'd to great exertions'.¹⁷ In a later letter from 20 February 1796, Hays contrasts Godwin's position as 'a philosopher, a man of first-rate talents' with her own as 'a woman, I mean by this, that education has given me a sexual character' (*Correspondence*, 434). She continues:

It is true, I have risen superior to the generality of my sex, I am not a mere fine lady, a domestic drudge, or a doll of fashion. I can think, write, reason, converse with men & scholars, & despise many petty, femenine [sic] prejudices. But I have not the talents for a legislator or reformer of the world, I still have many shrinking delicacies & female foibles, that unfit me for rising to arduous heights.

(*Correspondence*, 434)

Hays contrasts her character, corrupted by the sexual double standard, with Godwin's, whose talents and reputation protect him from the persecution and

17 *The Correspondence of Mary Hays (1759–1843), British Novelist*, ed. Marilyn L. Brooks (New York: The Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), 422. Subsequent references, in-text.

injustice which she has experienced. Hays reverses the order of these sentiments in the novel, situating Emma's refusal to be designated either a philosopher or a heroine *before* her analysis of how Mr Francis's masculinist philosophy fails to account for female desire. This is a critical rhetorical manoeuvre, as Emma pre-empts Mr Francis's criticism of her story so far as insane by stressing the artificial, acculturated nature of gendered identity. Hays's re-ordering of her letters to Godwin allows her to control the metafictional critique of her novel represented in Francis/Godwin's letter.

Francis's letter criticising Emma Courtney's narrative, in effect the novel itself up to this point, represents the extraordinary eruption of another writer's voice, based on a non-extant letter from Godwin tantalisingly excerpted in Hays's own reply of 6 February 1796, into Hays's novel. In this letter, Hays quotes from Godwin's letter in order to respond to it:

Had I, you say, 'worship'd at the altar of reason but half as assiduously as I have sacrificed at the shrine of illusion, my happiness might have been enviable.' – But, do you not perceive, that my reason was the auxiliary of my passion – or rather, my passion the generative principle of my reason?
(*Correspondence*, 425)

The pattern of Hays's reply, quotation followed by refutation, mirrors Mr Francis's literary critique of Emma's manuscript. Francis first tells Emma 'Your narrative leaves me full of admiration for your qualities, and compassion for your insanity' (*Emma Courtney*, 168),¹⁸ before quoting from the above-mentioned letter to Augustus and subjecting it to what amounts to Godwinian literary criticism:

I entreat however your attention to the following passage, extracted from your papers. 'After considering all I have urged, you may perhaps reply, that the subject is too nice, and too subtle, for reasoning, and that the heart is not to be compelled. This, I think, is a mistake. There is no topic, in fact, that may not be subjected to the laws of investigation and reasoning. What is it we desire? pleasure, happiness. What! the pleasure of an instant, only; or that which is more solid and permanent? I allow, pleasure is the supreme good! but it may be analysed. To this analysis I now call you?'

Could I, if I had studied an hundred years, invent a comment on your story, more salutary to your sorrows, more immoveable in its foundation, more clearly expressed, or more irresistibly convincing to every rational mind?

(168)

18 In her letter to Godwin, Hays describes herself as 'at least, a reasoning maniac – perhaps the most dangerous species of insanity' (*Correspondence*, 425) which Marilyn L. Brooks speculates is her response to Godwin's accusation of her own 'insanity' (fn, 425).

By having Francis quote Emma and then reply to Emma's point, as Harley never satisfactorily did, Hays both accentuates the difference between Francis/Godwin and Harley/Frend and underscores the disjunction in tone, purpose and character between Emma's narratorial voice and Francis's interjection. The first difference, between the two male characters, is a narrative concern: Augustus barely exists in the novel outside of Emma's eroticised representation of him to herself and her readers; Francis is a fully formed foil and confidant for Emma; the second difference is more radically a novelistic concern: it represents a complex change of voice. One of the criticisms of Hays's novel is that the reader is never allowed a perspective separate from Emma's own obsessive consciousness; on the contrary, with her inclusion of Godwin's critique of her novel, reformatted as Francis's letter, Hays allows a different, and deeply challenging, perspective on her narrative.¹⁹

Francis uses his quotation from Emma's narrative to drive his criticism of what he sees as her self-defeating desire to make herself miserable: 'The whole force of every thing which looks like a misfortune was assiduously, uninterruptedly, provided by yourself' (169). Francis enumerates 'a catalogue of all the real evils of human life; bodily pain, compulsory solitude, severe corporal labour ...' adding, 'But I should be ashamed of putting disappointed love into my enumeration' (169–70). He concludes his letter with a peroration on a very Godwinian ideal: 'The first lesson of enlightened reason, the great fountain of heroism and virtue, the principle by which alone man can become what man is capable of being, is *independence*' (170, original emphasis).

Hays's inclusion of a Godwinian critique of her novel is astonishingly bold, as Francis's argument seeks to overwhelm Emma's revolutionary goal of unleashing feminine desire by diminishing it as 'disappointed love'. However, Hays has carefully controlled this intrusion of another perspective by structuring her dialogue with Godwinian political philosophy to allow for the fullest expression of her Revolutionary feminism, revealing the masculine presuppositions underpinning radical philosophy. The re-ordering of her letters to Godwin has already prepared the reader for Emma's riposte to Francis, and her response to Godwin's political philosophy. Francis's terms in his apostrophe to independence are almost identical to the terms Emma rejects: his 'enlightened reason' is countered by her refusal to be considered a philosopher; his 'great fountain of heroism and virtue' by her denial of her own heroism; his 'principle by which alone man can become what man is capable of being' is almost mocked by her characterisation of herself as a '*woman, to whom education has given a sexual character*'. Education, a term that includes society and culture in Hays's usage, for women precludes any independence, as it conflates individual character with gendered preconceptions of female behaviour.

19 For example, Katherine Binhammer criticises *Emma Courtney*'s monomania in 'The Persistence of Reading: Governing Female Novel-Reading in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* and *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*', *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27.2 (Spring 2003), 1–22, 10.

Hays enlists Wollstonecraft's critique of eighteenth-century society's oppression of women to reveal the extent to which Godwin's political philosophy both fails to confront, and implicitly perpetuates, such misery. For example, Wollstonecraft begins the second chapter of her *Vindication* with this insight:

Women are told from their infancy, and taught by the example of their mothers, that a little knowledge of human weakness, justly termed cunning, softness of temper, *outward* obedience, and a scrupulous attention to a puerile kind of propriety, will obtain for them the protection of man ...
(*Vindication*, 88, emphasis in original)

In other words, women's sexualised education prepares them precisely for dependence, rather than independence, and this subordination corrupts both women's and men's minds. Emma echoes Wollstonecraft in her argument with Mr Francis, revealing the underlying sexual hierarchy embedded in Godwinian political philosophy. Emma first of all confronts Francis's dismissal of her love for Harley as imaginary misery:

What does it signify whether, abstractedly considered, a misfortune be worthy of the names real and substantial, if the consequences produced are the same? That which embitters all my life, that which stops the genial current of all health and peace is, whatever be its nature, a real calamity to me.
(*Emma Courtney*, 171)

In a footnote to this passage, Marilyn Brooks comments that 'Emma is taunting Mr Francis with the inadequacy of his fondness for abstraction. The phrase "abstractedly considered" is used frequently by Godwin in *Political Justice* to distinguish between rational conceptualisation and practical experience' (171). Hays accomplishes more than simply taunting Godwin here, using Godwinian tropes to critique his intellectual position. This shows Hays's sophisticated ability to enter into existing radical discourse and develop it in unexpected, individual and challenging ways.²⁰

Emma's reply to Francis's call to independence stutters with indignation: 'Why call woman, miserable, oppressed, and impotent, woman – *crushed, and then insulted* – why call her to *independence* – which not nature, but the barbarous and accursed laws of society, have denied her. *This is mockery!*' (173,

20 Moreover, Emma's question here is another excerpt from Hays's correspondence to Godwin, particularly the letter of 6 February which responds to Godwin's critique of her novel: 'What does it signify, whether abstractedly consider'd (if there be any such thing as abstraction) a misfortune be worthy of the names, substantial, or real, if the consequences are the same? That which embitters all my life, that which stops the genial current of health & peace, is, what ever be its nature, a substantial calamity to me!' (*Correspondence*, 425). Hays's parenthetical questioning of abstraction further attacks Godwin's philosophical dependence on the concept.

original emphases).²¹ Emma refashions herself as ‘woman’ here, as Francis wrote of ‘man’ achieving his potential through independence. This emotional response underscores Emma’s more philosophical analysis of the social and economic barriers against women’s independence, which she describes here as not natural inferiority but a cultural imposition. In her focus on the difficulties facing women seeking independence, Hays develops her own philosophical position based on Wollstonecraft’s analysis of the need to foster greater independence in women in her second *Vindication*, in which she argues: ‘It is vain to expect virtue from women till they are, in some degree, independent from men’ (*Vindication*, 211). Hays broadens Wollstonecraft’s scope from dependence on men, especially husbands, to ‘the barbarous and accursed laws of society’, showing how social, economic and judicial institutions conspire to deprive women of independence. *Emma Courtney* climaxes with the death of Augustus Harley, who admits his love for Emma on his deathbed. This conclusion represents a dark form of wish fulfilment for heroine and author as Emma’s distant love object, based on William Frend, is revealed to have loved Emma all along, unable to reciprocate her advances because of his sense of social propriety. The novel itself ends in a melodramatic bloodbath – Emma is forced, due to financial necessity, to marry Montague, who murders his illegitimate child then kills himself: an extreme example of women’s precarious social position, even in marriage. Montague, who seems like a suitable suitor, is revealed to be a violent adulterer. A second-generation fairy tale ending, in the burgeoning romance between Emma’s daughter and her adopted son Augustus Junior, is scotched by Emma Junior’s death.

Written three years after the publication of *Emma Courtney*, the *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*’s post facto attack on the novel was formulated in the reactionary literary atmosphere following Wollstonecraft’s death and Godwin’s scandalous *Memoirs* of his dead wife. The *Anti-Jacobin*’s review forms part of a wider assault on Godwin’s political philosophy and Wollstonecraft’s posthumous reputation. Framing its own critique of the novel by quoting the liberal *Monthly Review*’s positive response, the *Anti-Jacobin* emphasises the earlier review’s use of pro-revolutionary language, particularly Emma giving vent to her ‘wildest feelings with conscientious sincerity’, only to dismiss it:

Setting aside this slang of modern philosophy, the plain question is – Whether it is most for the advantage of society that women should be so brought up as to make them dutiful daughters, affectionate wives, tender mothers, and good Christians, or, by a corrupt and vicious system of education, fit them for revolutionary agents, for heroines, for Staels, for Talliens, for Stones,

21 In her 6 February 1796 letter, Hays berates Godwin in almost identical terms to Emma’s response to Francis: ‘Why call woman, miserable, oppress’d, & impotent, woman, crushed & then insulted – why call her to an “independence” which not nature, but the accursed & barbarous laws of society have denied her? – This is mockery – even you – wise & benevolent as you are – can mock a child of slavery & of sorrow!’ (*Correspondence*, 426).

setting aside all the decencies, the softness, the gentleness, of the female character, and enjoying indiscriminately every envied privilege of man?²²

The *Anti-Jacobin* links the *Monthly's* and Hays's interest in 'sincerity' with Godwin's demand for candour, aligning both with 'the slang of modern philosophy', again reducing Hays's engagement with and criticism of Godwin's 'modern' philosophy to a simplistic blind discipleship. In this review, and in the novel's subsequent reputation, *Emma Courtney*, a radical, feminist text which criticises Godwin's masculinist political philosophy and reveals its inability to address or ameliorate women's situation in society, is dismissed as a corollary to Godwin's ideas.

Via *Emma Courtney*, Hays creates her own innovative interpretation of female philosophy which takes elements from Wollstonecraft's feminism and Godwin's political philosophy in order to represent the female philosopher's intellectual development as founded on her passionate feelings, and to confront Godwinian philosophy with its limitations: its blindness on the position of women within patriarchal society. Emma's unwillingness to be labelled a philosopher reveals her, and her creator's, concerns that existing philosophical models do not allow for the balance of reason and passion which both Emma and Hays seek. Hays's novel seeks to develop a new form of female philosophy, balancing rationality with sensuality, revising representations of the female philosopher which have become entangled in both revolutionary and counter-revolutionary discourse which occludes the figure's radical potential. The contemporary reception of the novel as subordinate to Godwinian and Wollstonecraftian philosophy therefore underestimates Hays's sophisticated engagement with her friends's ideas, missing her complex revaluation of the female philosopher figure's importance.

'More mind': Wollstonecraft and imagination in Godwin's *Memoirs*

Hays published the first public notice of Wollstonecraft's death in September 1797, eulogising her friend and mentor in a brief but heartfelt and highly wrought obituary. Hays's Wollstonecraft couples a 'masculine tone of understanding' with 'exquisite sensibility', heroically straddling the gender divide.²³ Wollstonecraft is 'Quick to feel, and indignant to resist the iron hand of despotism', exerting herself to 'awaken the minds of her oppressed sex [to] a sense of their degradation, and to restore them to the dignity of reason and virtue'

22 Rev. of *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*, by Mary Hays, *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Literary Censor* 3 (London: J. Plymsell, J. Whittle and C. Chapple, 1799), 54.

23 See Mary Hays, 'Obituary of Wollstonecraft' in *Lives of the Great Romantics III: Godwin, Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley by Their Contemporaries*, Vol. 2: *Wollstonecraft*, ed. Harriet Jump (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1999), 7. Subsequent references, in-text as 'Obituary'.

(‘Obituary’, 7). Hays adds that Wollstonecraft’s ‘philosophic mind’ (7) also encompassed wider social, political and economic ills. However, she also paints her friend as a ‘victim of the vices and prejudices of mankind’ (7), commenting on the personal costs of a woman inhabiting the position of philosopher. Walker suggests that Hays raced to produce her version of Wollstonecraft before Godwin’s *Memoir* was published, in order to present ‘her Wollstonecraft, emphasising her proud feminism’ (*Growth of a Woman’s Mind*, 189, original emphasis). Hays’s desire to be first in print with her obituary hints at the tensions in her relationship with Godwin, who had refused to admit Hays to see Wollstonecraft on her deathbed, although she alludes to Godwin’s *Memoir* as being written by an ‘abler hand’ in her later letter to the *Monthly*.²⁴

Hays formulates her feminist philosophy by reformulating her correspondence with Wollstonecraft and Godwin into political polemic and polemical fiction. Godwin, too, relies on his private correspondence with Wollstonecraft when writing her biography, especially in his controversial concluding comments on Wollstonecraft’s intellectual character. Throughout the series of short notes and longer love letters which make up Godwin and Wollstonecraft’s private correspondence, philosophy returns as a term of teasing affection, sexualised importance, and rational debate, but it also informs the couple’s relationship at a deeper level, structuring their love affair and marriage. The correspondence reveals Wollstonecraft’s idiosyncratic combination of reason and passion, which Godwin draws upon for his idealised representation of her in the *Memoirs*. It is Wollstonecraft’s rationality which becomes a site of controversy and contention, both within Godwin’s biography and in the text’s contemporary and modern receptions. Her passionate sensibility, on the other hand, fuels Godwin’s representation of her as a Romantic heroine. Godwin uses his private correspondence with Wollstonecraft to drive his competing representations of her as both philosopher and lover. My emphasis on Wollstonecraft and Godwin’s private correspondence, rather than Wollstonecraft and Gilbert Imlay’s, which Godwin publishes to conveniently (and conventionally) package Wollstonecraft as a literary heroine of sensibility, reconstructs an alternative ‘lived’ account of the couple’s engagement with the domestic affections and public philosophy. Stormy exchanges of philosophical debate and private passion are refigured in my account in a way which keeps ‘philosophy’ – as both intellectual argument and sexual activity – alive.

Drawing on Godwin’s publication of Wollstonecraft’s letters to Imlay, rather than their own unpublished correspondence, Mary Jacobus analyses the split between the revolutionary female philosopher figures of the 1790s and a prototypical Romantic heroine in Godwin’s representation of Wollstonecraft.²⁵ Jacobus focuses on Godwin’s publication of Wollstonecraft’s letters to Gilbert

24 Mary Hays, ‘Letter to the Editor’ *The Monthly Magazine* 4 (October 1797), 1.

25 See Mary Jacobus, ‘Intimate Connections: Scandalous Memoirs and Epistolary Indiscretion’ in *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700–1830*, eds Elizabeth Eger et al. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 274–89.

Imlay which tend ‘to assimilate both her love life and her letters to a literary culture of sensibility’, meaning, for Godwin, that ‘her “life” is all “works”; living and writing are equivalent’ (‘Intimate Connections’, 280). She criticises Godwin’s decision to publish these letters as ‘ill-judged’ but ‘entirely consistent with his Enlightenment (and proto-Habermasian) belief in a public sphere of unimpeded rational communication’ (281). Aligning herself with revisionist accounts of Habermas, Jacobus has already criticised *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* ‘for its unitary, unnuanced, ungendered, disembodied, classless and de-racinated account of the bourgeois public sphere’, arguing that the Habermasian public sphere ‘seems both an abstraction and an idealisation – at best a mobilising fiction for cultural theorists, at worst a “phantom public sphere” ... , lacking either libidinal investments or a textual unconscious’ (276). As I argue in my introduction, Habermas is more aware of the fictional quality of his conception of the public sphere than Jacobus allows. Her revisionist criticisms of Habermas’s public sphere do not move beyond problems already addressed within the text of his *Structural Transformation*. Habermas argues that the slippages between eighteenth-century private and public sphere occluded the function of marriage in ensuring the development of capitalist hegemony. Habermas describes how ‘the conjugal family’s self-image of its intimate sphere ... collided even within the consciousness of the bourgeoisie itself with the real functions of the bourgeois family’: the reproduction of capital through inheritance.²⁶ Godwin senses Wollstonecraft’s position between public and private spheres, which situates her on an ideological faultline in eighteenth-century thought. Throughout the *Memoirs*, he oscillates between celebrating Wollstonecraft’s divisiveness and obfuscating it by placing her awkwardly in the domestic sphere.

In the *Memoirs*, Godwin searches for a philosophical basis on which to privilege the ‘domestic affections’, or private family feeling, as stimuli to act in the public sphere, inspired by his Romanticised representation of Wollstonecraft, and developed through his analysis of the connections between her private self and public writing. In their private letters, ‘philosophy’ becomes a crucial nexus for Godwin and Wollstonecraft’s debates over the relationship between reason and passion, first as a means for Wollstonecraft to tease Godwin out of his nervously protected bachelorhood, then potentially as a quirky pseudonym for the sexual act, and finally as a contested term in their continuing argument over the place of the domestic affections in private life, the public sphere and their own different philosophical systems. The couple’s disagreements and reconciliations highlight the extent to which the Wollstonecraft in Godwin’s *Memoirs* is a radical, Romanticised representation, reconciling the tensions between domesticity and philosophy throughout their uneasy courtship and marriage.

On 18 August 1796, Wollstonecraft and Godwin exchanged a series of emotionally fraught letters on their deepening feelings for each other, sharing their

26 Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, trans. Thomas Burger (1989) (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991), 47. Subsequent references in-text.

doubts about the relationship, and situating the importance of the imagination in both their private lives and public philosophies. Explaining her hurt feelings from a perceived snub by Godwin, Wollstonecraft admits that she is ‘Mortified and humbled, I scarcely know why – still, despising false delicacy I almost fear I have lost sight of the true’ (*Collected Letters*, 348), wishing she could flee to France or Italy to ‘become again a *Solitary Walker*’ (349), underscoring the importance of Rousseau in her self-image with this last reference to his *Reveries of a Solitary Walker* (1782). She complains to Godwin that her ‘Imagination is for ever betraying me into false misery’ (348) and instructs him to ‘Consider what has passed as a fever of your imagination’ (349). In reply, Godwin apologises for his dilatory response to Wollstonecraft’s advances, explaining ‘I feared that I might be deceiving myself as to your feelings, & that I was feeding my mind with groundless assumptions’.²⁷ He urges her against returning to her life as a solitary walker, and directly counters her fears of false delicacy, stating ‘I see nothing in you but what I respect and adore’. ‘Upon consideration I find in you one fault, & but one’, he tells her. ‘You have the feelings of nature, & you have the honesty to avow them. In all this you do well. I am sure you do. But do not let them tyrannise over you. Estimate everything at its just value’ (173). He concludes his conciliatory letter by asking for some comfort himself: ‘Do you not see, while I exhort you to be a philosopher, how painfully acute are my own feelings? I need some soothing, though I cannot ask it from you’ (174). Godwin’s mild criticism of the tyranny of Wollstonecraft’s feelings prompts her to consider their intellectual differences:

One word of my ONLY fault – our imaginations have been rather differently employed – I am more of a painter than you – I like to tell the truth, my taste for the picturesque has been more cultivated – I delight to view the grand scenes of nature and the various changes of the human countenance ... My affections have been more exercised than yours, I believe, and my senses are quick, without the aid of fancy – yet tenderness always prevails, which inclines me to be angry with myself, when I do not animate and please those I [love].

(*Collected Letters*, 350)

Wollstonecraft’s account of their differently employed imaginations is echoed in Godwin’s later account of her intellectual character in which he contrasts his ‘attempt at logical and metaphysical distinction’ with her ‘taste for the picturesque’.²⁸ This shows the extent to which Godwin drew on their private correspondence, particularly these emotionally charged missives, in order to

27 William Godwin, *The Letters of William Godwin*, Vol. 1: 1778–1797, ed. Pamela Clemit (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 173.

28 William Godwin, *Memoirs of the Author of ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’* (1798) in *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 1, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1992), 140. Hereinafter, *Memoirs*. Subsequent references, in-text.

create his representation of Wollstonecraft, especially her imagination, in the *Memoirs*.

Throughout the conclusions to both first and second editions of his *Memoirs of Wollstonecraft*, Godwin draws on this private correspondence to contrast Wollstonecraft's character with his own. The first edition begins by setting up a gendered difference: 'We had cultivated our powers ... in different directions; I chiefly an attempt at logical and metaphysical distinction, she a taste for the picturesque' (*Memoirs*, 140). Godwin returns here to his private correspondence with Wollstonecraft, drawing on her distinction between their uses of the imagination to insist on a traditional divide between masculine and feminine intellectual characteristics, reducing Wollstonecraft's life and thought to the 'taste for the picturesque' she identifies with in her letter, whereas he seeks for 'logical and metaphysical distinction'. His next sentence seems to me to express Godwin's dissatisfaction with this reduction: 'One of the leading passions of my mind has been an anxious desire not to be deceived', leading him to 'examine and re-examine' particular issues, as he will do in returning to Wollstonecraft's personality in the second edition (140).

In the first edition, Godwin continues to contrast their characters: 'I did not possess ... an intuitive perception of intellectual beauty ... What I wanted in this respect, Mary possessed, in a degree superior to any other person I ever knew. The strength of her mind lay in intuition' (140). Godwin's interest in summarising Wollstonecraft's philosophical personality lies in its complementarity to his own. In this way, Godwin's most upsetting declaration, 'and yet, though perhaps, in the strict sense of the term, she reasoned little, it is surprising what a degree of soundness is to be found in her determinations' (notice how the central clause 'she reasoned little' is hedged by qualifiers 'and yet', 'though perhaps', 'in the strict sense of the term', 'it is surprising'), is used to complement Godwin's indecisiveness: 'my oscillation and scepticism were fixed by her boldness' (140–1). Godwin's conclusion attempts to gender Wollstonecraft within appropriate eighteenth-century parameters, stressing her appreciation of beauty, her intuition, and lack of reason. However, even within this attempt, Wollstonecraft challenges these boundaries with her intellectual boldness, in contrast to Godwin's oscillating scepticism.

In the second edition, Godwin generalises the distinction between himself as logical and Wollstonecraft as intuitive into a statement of absolute gender difference: 'A circumstance by which the two sexes are particularly distinguished from each other, is, that the one is accustomed more to the exercise of its reasoning powers, and the other of its feelings' (156). Godwin's 'attempt at logical and metaphysical distinction' is here elevated to the male sex's 'exercise of its reasoning powers'; Wollstonecraft's 'taste for the picturesque' further reduced into a woman's exercise of her 'feelings'. Finally, Godwin argues that 'Mary and myself perhaps each carried farther than to its common extent the characteristic of the sexes to which we belonged' (156). Godwin moves from acknowledging that this gender difference is customary, that men are 'accustomed more to the exercise' of reason and women of feelings, rather than biological, to the more

troubling declaration that he and Wollstonecraft represent extremes of masculinity or of femininity. This statement elides his own more complex representation of Wollstonecraft's radical challenge to gender norms throughout the *Memoirs*, as well as obfuscating the extent to which their private correspondence debated the way in which the imagination acts as a bridge between feeling and reasoning powers.

Godwin goes on to reiterate his own 'love of intellectual distinction', lack of 'an intuitive sense of the pleasures of the imagination', and 'anxious desire not to be deceived', concluding nervously enough for a second edition, 'Endless disquisition however is not always the parent of certainty' (156). For him, Wollstonecraft complements and counters his own strengths and weaknesses:

Her feelings had a character of peculiar strength and decision; and the discovery of them ... she found herself unable to control ... Her education had been fortunately free from the prejudices of system and bigotry, and her sensitive and generous spirit was left to the spontaneous exercise of its own decisions. The warmth of her heart defended her from artificial rules of judgement; and it is therefore surprising what a degree of soundness pervaded her sentiments. In the strict sense of the term, she had reasoned comparatively little; and she was therefore little subject to diffidence and scepticism ...
(156–7)

In this passage, Godwin further qualifies the controversial clause from his first edition, 'she reasoned little', not only with 'comparatively', but throughout the rest of the long paragraph. Godwin romanticises Wollstonecraft's lifelong struggle to direct and control her powerful emotional energy as an overflow of feminine feeling. He turns her lack of formal education into an opportunity for the 'spontaneous exercise of [her spirit's] own decisions'. He transforms her critique of 'artificial rules of judgement' into a surprising 'degree of soundness' in her sentiments. Finally, he depersonalises the earlier account of his own 'oscillation and scepticism' in the first edition, which contrasted with Wollstonecraft's 'boldness', to her own lack of 'diffidence and scepticism' in the second edition. Godwin concludes his *Memoirs* with the claim: 'While I have described the improvement I was in the act of receiving, I believe I have put down the leading traits of her intellectual character' (141). Godwin's representation of Wollstonecraft's intellectual character seems to collapse his complex characterisation of her into stereotypical assumptions about gender. However, by using Wollstonecraft's own representation of her imagination contrasted with his, Godwin shows his willingness to be guided by Wollstonecraft in the imaginative development of his own political philosophy.

'Philosophy' moves from being a term of gentle mockery between Wollstonecraft and Godwin to a highly charged part of their love affair, possibly euphemistic of the sexual act itself, and finally to a marker in their continuing debate over the importance of the domestic affections in both private and public life. Upon receiving one of Godwin's love letters, Wollstonecraft responds with a

clear expression both of her own feelings and her own philosophy. She thanks him for his letter by telling him ‘you know not how much tenderness for you may escape in a voluptuous sigh, should the air, as is often the case, give a pleasurable movement to the sensations, that have been clustering round my heart, as I read this morning – reminding myself, every now and then, that the writer *loved me*’ (4 October 1796, 370–1). She then corrects herself:

Voluptuous is often expressive of a meaning I do not now intend to give. I would describe one of those moments, when the senses are exactly tuned by the rising tenderness of the heart, and according reason entices you to live in the present moment, regardless of the past or future – It is not rapture. – It is a sublime tranquillity. I have felt it in your arms.

(*Collected Letters*, 371)

In this beautiful passage, Wollstonecraft moves from the senses, to the passions (‘the rising tenderness of the heart’), to her reasoning faculties (‘according reason’) to explicate her sensation of ‘sublime tranquillity’: a movement, both rational and passionate, which allows her to live in and enjoy the present moment – in other words, love. In several letters, Wollstonecraft dwells on the happiness of being in love and being loved, as well as in making love. For example, on 13 November, she writes to Godwin: ‘If the felicity of last night has had the same effect on your health as on my countenance, you have no cause to lament your failure of resolution: for I have seldom seen so much live fire running about my features as this morning when recollections – very dear; called forth the blush of pleasure, as I adjusted my hair’ (375). And in another letter, dated 23 December 1796, she concludes with an echo of Hamlet: ‘There are other pleasures in the world, you perceive, beside those know [sic] to your philosophy’ (386). Wollstonecraft returns here to the gentle teasing of her early relationship with Godwin, but in this case, she uses their shared experience of falling in love to underscore her point: that Godwin’s published works and private conversations do not take into account the effect of the domestic affections on individual and social life.

Before discussing the progress of his love affair with Wollstonecraft, he candidly represents the awkwardness of their first meeting, revealing the challenging, uncompromising woman with whom he would later fall in love. Arriving at the publisher Joseph Johnson’s house to listen to Paine, he found instead that ‘the conversation lay principally between me and Mary. I, of consequence, heard her, very frequently when I wished to hear Paine’ (*Memoirs*, 113). Discussing the moral character of eminent men, Godwin has Wollstonecraft ‘bestowing censure with a plentiful hand’ whereas he ‘had a strong propensity, to favourable construction’; religious argument was a source of friction since the very beginning of their relationship, as ‘her opinions approached much nearer to the received ones, than mine’. Godwin concludes, ‘We touched upon all topics, without treating forcibly and connectedly upon any’ (113). Finally, in retelling their disagreement amongst other friends, Godwin discovered that whereas he

was magnanimous enough 'to yield her the praise of a person of active and independent thinking', Wollstonecraft 'did me no part of what perhaps I considered as justice' (113). Godwin's troubled account of his first meeting with Wollstonecraft reveals a strictly unromantic vision of his later wife: difficult, pugnacious, even wearisome.

Godwin's account of their second meeting, love affair, and marriage refuses likewise to align it with societal mores, and is tintured by both his love for her and his grief at her death. Godwin confronts these cultural prejudices in the introductory paragraph of Chapter Nine: 'If there ever were any motives of prudence or delicacy, that could impose a qualification upon the story, they are now over. They could have no relation but to factitious rules of decorum. There are no circumstances of her life, that, in the judgment of honour and reason, could brand her with disgrace' (127). Wollstonecraft's life, for Godwin, transcends convention: 'motives of prudence or delicacy', those feminine virtues, have no place in his representation of their relationship, replaced instead by 'the judgment of honour and reason'. In response to the outcry, created by his challenge to the 'factitious rules of decorum' throughout the *Memoirs*, Godwin adds in the second edition: 'She had errors; but her errors, which were not those of a sordid mind, were connected and interwoven with the qualities most characteristic of her disposition and genius' (155). Again, Godwin uses the opportunity of a second edition to sharpen his radical, romanticised vision of Wollstonecraft: even her flaws contribute to her intellectual gifts and personal charms.

Godwin's depiction of the couple's blossoming love for each other carefully transgresses gender expectations: 'The partiality we conceived for each other ... grew with equal advances in the mind of each ... One sex did not take the priority which long established custom had awarded it, nor the other overstep that delicacy which is so severely imposed' (128). In this passage, Godwin both stresses the revolutionary equality of their affair in that he did not take on a leading, masculine or aggressive role in the seduction, but also carefully presents Wollstonecraft's actions as in line with customary notions of female delicacy: 'I am not conscious that either party can assume to have been the agent or the patient, the toil-spreader or the prey, in the affair. When, in the course of things, the disclosure came, there was nothing, in a manner, for either party to disclose to the other' (128). It is difficult to understand how their relationship progressed if this mutually passive description is to be believed; even as Godwin attempts to quietly feminise his wife in this passage, one suspects that it was Wollstonecraft who drove the relationship forwards.

Godwin struggles to justify his and Wollstonecraft's decision to marry, controversially making it clear in the first edition that the couple had sex outside of marriage:

We did not marry. It is difficult to recommend any thing to indiscriminate adoption, contrary to the established rules and prejudices of mankind; but certainly nothing can be so ridiculous upon the face of it, or so contrary to the genuine march of sentiment, as to require the overflowing of the soul to

wait upon a ceremony, and that which, wherever delicacy and imagination exist, is of all things most sacredly private, to blow a trumpet before it, and to record the moment when it has arrived at its climax.

(129)

In the second edition, Godwin removes the sexual imagery – ‘the overflowing of the soul’; ‘climax’; qualifies their marital situation – ‘We did not immediately marry’; removes the equivocal terms ‘sentiment’ and ‘delicacy’, which he discovered to have very different applications in the Anti-Jacobin reaction to his biography; and adds his own equivocating argument in (slight) favour of marriage: ‘an accurate morality will direct us to comply with customs and institutions, which, if we had a voice in their introduction, it would have been incumbent on us to negative’ (155). Godwin’s depiction of his eccentric living arrangements with Wollstonecraft, in which they worked and visited friends separately, to meet again in the evening – ‘We seemed to combine ... the novelty and lively sensation of a visit, with the more delicious and heart-felt pleasures of domestic life’ (133) – is repeated in his idealised vision of the domestic situation of St Leon and his wife, Marguerite de Damville, further explored below. Throughout his engagement with the series of Wollstonecraft’s relationships leading up to theirs, Godwin represents her developing radicalism, reaching its pinnacle in their deliberately non-conformist union, together with a Romantic vision of her as both challenging and charming.

Godwin’s analysis of Wollstonecraft’s most famous text, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, focuses on her self-representation throughout the polemic, tracing the links between her private self and public, authorial persona. He strives to connect Wollstonecraft’s radical philosophy in her polemic to her developing status as a Romantic heroine of sensibility within the rest of the *Memoirs*, a strategy which reveals some of the stresses within his representation of his wife. He begins by celebrating the text as ‘certainly a very bold and original production’ (109). However, he is anxiously apologetic about the boldness and originality of Wollstonecraft’s thought throughout the remainder of his evaluation. His discomfort is revealed in the juxtaposition of complimentary and critical passages. He asserts that ‘Many of the sentiments are undoubtedly of a rather masculine description. The spirited and decisive way in which the author explodes the system of gallantry, and the species of homage with which the sex is usually treated, shocked the majority’, which seems to appreciate Wollstonecraft’s ‘masculine’ explosion of specious gallantry. This is undercut by Godwin’s later admission, ‘There are also, it must be confessed, occasional passages of a stern and rugged feature, incompatible with the true stamina of the writer’s character’ (109). In this paragraph, Godwin moves from appreciating Wollstonecraft’s ‘spirited and decisive’ manner to criticising the way in which her writing style can become instead ‘stern and rugged’. Here, Godwin strives to celebrate Wollstonecraft’s ‘masculine’ style when ‘spirited and decisive’, tying in with his later depiction of her bold decision-making in his conclusion, criticising her more aggressive asides.

In fact, as his analysis continues, Godwin seeks to replace the 'masculine' cast of Wollstonecraft's self-representation as a political polemicist with a more socially acceptable 'feminine' image. Godwin first conflates Wollstonecraft's earlier 'masculine' sentiments into a 'rigid and somewhat amazonian temper', reducing her challenge to gender norms into an eighteenth-century favourite, the fierce but female figure of the Amazon. He then further feminises Wollstonecraft by associating her with both the 'luxuriance of imagination' and 'delicacy of sentiment' (109), all four terms traditionally gendered feminine at the time. Godwin's anxiety over the 'masculine' quality of Wollstonecraft's writing, and his desire to feminise her, is indicative of a wider ideological debate over the extent to which women could act in the public sphere. From a Habermasian standpoint, Godwin seeks to position Wollstonecraft in the more acceptable sphere of literary production, smoothing the rougher edges of her political argument by placing her *Vindication* within more feminine generic parameters.

Godwin returns to Wollstonecraft's perceived gender-bending in the *Vindication* by analysing her personal reception after the work's publication, contrasting the public's (or perhaps his own) expectations of finding 'a sturdy, muscular, raw-boned virago' with their surprise 'when instead of all this, they found a woman, lovely in her person, and, in the best and most engaging sense, feminine in her manners' (109–10). Godwin uses the opportunity of a second edition to invent further insulting expectations of Wollstonecraft's imagined appearance, changing this nightmare Wollstonecraft from a 'sturdy, muscular, raw-boned virago' to a 'rude, pedantic, dictatorial virago', shifting the emphasis on Wollstonecraft's perceived physical masculinity to her imagined personality. Godwin's concluding remarks again shift between celebration and apology, making a huge claim for the endurance of Wollstonecraft's work at the same time as criticising its style: 'The Vindication of the Rights of Woman [sic] is undoubtedly a very unequal performance, and eminently deficient in method and arrangement ... But when we consider the importance of its doctrines, and the eminence of genius it displays, it seems not very improbable that it will be read as long as the English language endures' (110). In his treatment of Wollstonecraft's relationship with Henry Fuseli (discussed further below), Godwin criticises Fuseli for his belief in the 'divinity of genius' as 'a power that comes complete at once from the hands of the creator of all things, and the first essays of a man of real genius are such, in all their grand and most important features, as no subsequent assiduity can mend' (111). Godwin's criticism of Wollstonecraft's *Vindication* as 'eminently deficient in method and arrangement', whilst celebrating its genius, is echoed in his critique of Fuseli's arrogant lack of 'assiduity' in his own pursuit of genius. One of Godwin's conclusions about Wollstonecraft and Fuseli's relationship is that 'Mary came something more of a cynic out of the school of Mr Fuseli, than she went into it' (111). His treatment of the *Vindication*'s flawed genius further seems to be confronting the trace of Fuseli's influence in Wollstonecraft's writing style.

Godwin had expressed similar reservations about Wollstonecraft's writing style during her life, precipitating a fierce disagreement between the two. Her

letters provide an alternative reading of Godwin's problem with the style of the *Vindication*. In a letter dated 4 September 1796, Wollstonecraft complains that the 'radical defect' Godwin perceives in her writing style leaves her with an invidious choice: 'I must either disregard your opinion, think it unjust, or throw down my pen in despair; and that would be tantamount to resigning existence; for at fifteen I resolved never to marry from interested motives, or to endure a life of dependence' (*Collected Letters*, 357). Neither Godwin's original criticism of the defect in Wollstonecraft's writing nor his response to this letter exists in writing (it is possibly based on a disagreement in person, in any case), but in October 1796 he started tutoring her in Latin grammar, an event interpreted by Janet Todd as Wollstonecraft accepting the legitimacy of some of Godwin's criticisms (fn 357). In her letter, Wollstonecraft's swift slippage between Godwin's criticism of her writing style and the question of being dependent on a husband reveals both her anxieties about remaining independent and the centrality of writing to her sense of self. She then mounts an ardent defence of her personal style, based on both intellectual and emotional grounds:

And, for I would wish you to see my heart and mind just as it appears to myself, without drawing any veil of affected humility over it, though this whole letter is a proof of painful diffidence, I am compelled to think that there is something in my writings more valuable, than in the productions of some people on whom you bestow warm eulogiums – I mean more mind – denominate it as you will – more of the observations of my own senses, more of the combining of my own imagination – the effusion of my own feelings and passions than the cold workings of the brain on the materials procured by the senses and imagination of other writers.

(358)

Wollstonecraft's self-justification moves from a wish for absolute candour, however painful, to a proud declaration of her own talents compared to those of Godwin's favoured authors,²⁹ to an exemplification of the wellsprings of these talents: the senses, the imagination, feelings and passions. These will become the touchstones for Godwin's uncertain celebration of his wife's heart and mind. Whereas Wollstonecraft connects her imagination, feelings and passions to the strength of her intellectual pursuits, explaining her sense that her writings contain 'more mind' than those of other authors, Godwin often seems to separate his consideration of her sensibility, which he admires, from her intellect, which he finds troubling. Wollstonecraft's focus on the imagination in this letter from September 1796 harks back to the couple's earlier

29 Discussing the sources informing *Political Justice*, Peter H. Marshall lists Godwin's favourite authors including: Thucydides, Livy, Sallust, Plutarch, Rollin, Montesquieu, Voltaire, Rousseau, D'Holbach, Helvétius, Condillac, Mably, Raynal, Mirabeau, Turgot, Locke, Clarke, Collins, Edwards, Hume, Price and Priestley, in *William Godwin* (Yale University Press, 1984), 83.

discussion on the differences in their imaginations in August that year (discussed above).³⁰

Godwin uses Wollstonecraft's private correspondence on love, philosophy and imagination in order to refine his views on the position of the 'domestic affections', or love, in his own political philosophy. Mark Philp argues against the claim that his relationship with Wollstonecraft 'must necessarily have had a profound impact on Godwin', downplaying her role in his changing appreciation of the place of the domestic affections in his publications (*Godwin's Political Justice*, 175). Philp suggests that *St. Leon* and *Fleetwood* show evidence of such a change, but not the third edition of *Political Justice* nor the first edition of the *Memoirs* (175). I locate the effect of Wollstonecraft on his understanding of the role of intimacy in political justice in the rewritten account of Wollstonecraft's relationship with Henry Fuseli in the second edition of the *Memoirs*. This passage is so important for Godwin that he repeats it in *St. Leon* and in his *Reply to Dr. Parr*, arguing that his public philosophy of political justice is able to incorporate his developing appreciation of domesticity.

This extensively rewritten passage indirectly bears witness to Wollstonecraft's emotional impact on Godwin through his treatment of her relationship with Fuseli. Godwin uses the second edition to make a more general statement on the place of the domestic affections in his political philosophy by abstracting Fuseli from his account. In the first edition, his description of Wollstonecraft's developing attachment to Fuseli simply, and to Godwin's contemporary readers shockingly, tells of the 'delight she enjoyed in his society ... transferred by association to his person', arguing that 'the state of celibacy and restraint in which she had hitherto lived' added to her passion for the artist (111). Godwin stresses Wollstonecraft's realisation that Fuseli's marriage denied her the opportunity of further developing this relationship as she would like, but makes it clear that 'There is no reason to doubt that, if Mr Fuseli had been disengaged at the period of their acquaintance, he would have been the man of her choice' (112). He candidly concludes: 'As it was, she conceived it both practicable and eligible, to cultivate a distinguishing affection for him, and to foster it by the endearments of personal intercourse and a reciprocation of kindness, without departing in the smallest degree from the rules she prescribed to herself' (112). Godwin's careful distinction here between societal and self-willed 'rules' of decorum obfuscates Wollstonecraft's much more radical offer to live as Fuseli's mistress together with his wife: a reconfiguration of the family beyond even Godwin's radical desire for sincerity.³¹ In the reworked passage,

30 See Karen Green, 'The Passions and the Imagination in Wollstonecraft's Theory of Moral Judgement' *Utilitas* 9 (1997), 271–90, for a comparison of Wollstonecraft's position on the imagination with Godwin, Rousseau, Richard Price and Adam Smith, setting the couple's debates within the wider arguments on the role of feeling and sympathy in ethical reasoning.

31 See Janet Todd, *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Revolutionary Life* (London: Phoenix, 2001), xi.

Wollstonecraft's troubling relationship with the Swiss painter gets transformed into a prophetic account of Godwin's own love for Wollstonecraft.

Godwin substantially edits the paragraph in the second edition detailing Wollstonecraft's love for Fuseli, moving from the concrete details of Wollstonecraft's admiration for the painter to a more abstract apologia for her privileging of private feeling over public decorum. In the end, he offers, as Myers points out, 'a position paper on domestic affections as vivifiers of sensibility and social sympathy' ('Shaping', 315). To explain the delight Wollstonecraft took both in Fuseli's society and his person, Godwin generalises from her experience to form a corollary to his own philosophy on the place of the domestic affections within his idea of political justice. He asks his reader to 'recollect how dear to persons of sensibility is the exercise of the affections' (*Memoirs*, 151), developing this point in a long paragraph he would excerpt in his preface to *St. Leon* and quote again in his *Reply to Dr. Parr*.

Godwin begins by arguing that 'True wisdom will recommend to us individual attachments' (*Memoirs*, 151) which sounds like a commonplace platitude. Read in the light of his previous arguments against any sense of private obligation in *Political Justice*, it is a painfully exact recantation of this position. In the chapter 'Of Promises' in *Political Justice*, Godwin argues against promises because the sense of obligation which arises from the use of them obstructs actions 'of general application' for the good of human happiness.³² Individual obligations, in this analysis, are either surplus to requirements, as a sense of justice would require the promised action to be fulfilled without needing a promise, or hypocritical, forcing someone to act against their sense of justice. In the *Memoirs*, Godwin strives to connect his new emphasis on the domestic affections with his old arguments for societal justice, as 'the man who lives in the midst of domestic relations, will have many opportunities of conferring pleasure, minute in the detail, yet not trivial in the amount, without interfering with the purposes of general benevolence' (151). Godwin stresses the happiness and virtue attendant on domestic affections, which before he argued should be solely dependent on an individual's engagement in 'disinterested benevolence': now, such benevolence is created and expanded through private relationships.³³ The final sentence of the paragraph makes clear the introspective movement away from Wollstonecraft's relationship with Fuseli to her effect on his private life and public philosophy: 'Nay, by kindling his sensibility, and harmonizing his soul, they ['individual attachments'] may be expected, if he is endowed with a liberal and manly spirit, to render him more prompt in the service of strangers and of the public' (*Memoirs*, 151). Godwin indirectly attests here to Wollstonecraft's effect on his personal beliefs and political philosophy; his

32 William Godwin, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793) in *Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin*, vol. 3, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1993), 87.

33 In *Political Justice*, Book IV, Chapter VIII 'Of the Principle of Virtue', Godwin argues that disinterested benevolence is the only basis for virtue, critiquing earlier philosophers such as de La Rochefoucauld and Rousseau for promulgating the negative theory of self-love, which at its best can only 'place the perfection of virtue in doing no injury', 195.

experience of falling in love with her inspires his broadening the scope and significance of private felicity into public benevolence.

Wollstonecraft's Ghost in *St. Leon*

Godwin's *Memoirs* act primarily as a work of mourning for Wollstonecraft. In *St. Leon*, Godwin transmutes this mourning into nostalgia for a lost revolutionary moment in his fictional (anti)hero's relationship with the idealised Wollstonecraftian figure in the novel, Marguerite de Damville. The complexity of the novel, already balanced between the radicalism of Godwin's early work, especially his portrait of Wollstonecraft in the *Memoirs*, and the more conservative demands placed upon his writing in the post-revolutionary period, resides in the contradictory tension between Godwin's genuine nostalgia for the revolutionary potential of the early 1790s and his perceptive critique of the paralysing quality of such nostalgia. Godwin draws on the conclusions he reaches in the second edition of the *Memoirs* about the importance of the domestic affections in ensuring the justice of one's public actions in order to mount his critique both of St Leon's increasingly selfish actions and in society's inability to respond ethically to challenging individuals.

On the other hand, the *Anti-Jacobin Review* itself claims to be 'delighted to find the social and domestic virtues placed in their proper rank' in *St. Leon*.³⁴ The *Anti-Jacobin* gives *St. Leon* an extraordinarily positive review given the scorn piled on Godwin's *Memoirs*, and his earlier works. Indeed, Godwin's novel is read as 'an opportunity [for Godwin] of retracting many of the opinions advanced in his former works' (151), focusing on the preface's awkward apologia for the melding of the domestic affections onto a pursuit of political justice. It concludes that Godwin's 'style is more polished, and altogether more pleasing, than in his former novel' (153). The *Anti-Jacobin* misreads Godwin's novel as a recantation of his former philosophy, positioning it as effectively *Anti-Jacobin*. The magazine notices Godwin's shift of direction, but its gleeful appropriation of *St. Leon* as his philosophical recantation misses the novel's more complex critique of the ways in which socio-political systems combine to corrupt individual relationships, particularly the links Godwin draws in the novel between the religious suspicion aroused by St Leon's secret alchemy and the persecution of radical philosophers in the late 1790s.

In his analysis of Godwin's novel, Gary Handwerk contrasts Godwin's 'liberal critique of institutional power', consistent with *Political Justice*, with a 'Romantically sceptical assessment of the power of any individual to free his mind from the ideological fetters of his age'.³⁵ Handwerk concludes by questioning the historical specificity of Godwin's dilemma:

34 Rev. of *St. Leon*, by William Godwin, *The Anti-Jacobin Review* 5 (London: J. Plymsell et al., 1800), 152.

35 Gary Handwerk, 'History, Trauma, and the Limits of the Liberal Imagination: William Godwin's Historical Fiction' in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*, eds. Tilottama Rajan and Julia Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 64–85, 75.

Liberalism and Romanticism had already in his lifetime begun to drift further and further apart, the former prey to recurrent waves of unselfconscious progressivist optimism, the latter trapped within one or another nostalgic visions of the past. Two centuries later, Godwin's question remains as open for us as it was for him: how might the liberal imagination come to acknowledge the reality of [historical] repetition and, rather than denying its force or lamenting its futility, seek to invest it with some positive value in the political economy of the psyche?

(82)

For Handwerk, Godwin remains trapped between a liberal and romantic view of the past, unable to move out of this deadlock to imbue the catastrophes of history with positive meaning. For me, the attempt to wrangle a sense of progress from history's catastrophes, particularly the French Revolution, is one of the defining characteristics of post-revolutionary fiction, as it tempers the earlier radicalism of the 1790s with a more moderate recognition of the need for social stability. As Godwin discovered to his cost after the reactionary response to the publication of the *Memoirs*, and which he muses over in the fictional format of *St. Leon*, such action is liable to misreading, misrepresentation and misuse by forces inimical to radical projects. In *St. Leon*, Godwin fictionalises his insight, developed over the course of the two editions of the *Memoirs*, that private behaviour underpins public action, by showing how his protagonist's failure to behave appropriately in his domestic relationships impedes his ability to act successfully in the public sphere. However, Godwin himself fails to imagine a role for women in his reconception of the domestic affections beyond offering emotional support for men.

Godwin uses the preface of *St. Leon*, and the novel as a whole, to introduce modifications to his argument in *Political Justice*. He argues against 'any change' in his fundamental argument concerning justice, but places within this broader polemic the 'domestic and private affections' as 'not incompatible with a profound and active sense of justice in the mind of him that cherishes them'.³⁶ By quoting from his *Memoirs of Wollstonecraft*, Godwin concludes the preface by maintaining the links between his radical philosophy, notorious biography and new fictional project, in the face of the reactionary attacks orchestrated by the *Anti-Jacobin* against him. Godwin concludes the preface by defending himself against the anticipated charge of inconsistency, 'the affections and charities of private life being every where in this publication a topic of the warmest eulogium, while in the Enquiry concerning Political Justice [sic] they seemed to be treated with no great degree of indulgence and favour' (*St. Leon*, 11). The first edition then adds, 'The way in which these seemingly jarring principles may be reconciled, is in part pointed out in a little book which I gave to the public in

36 William Godwin, *St. Leon: A Tale of the Sixteenth Century* (1799), ed. Pamela Clemit in *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 4 (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992), 11. Subsequent references, in-text.

the year 1798' (11). He then quotes from the *Memoirs*, the 'little book' to which he is referring, the crucially re-edited passage regarding Wollstonecraft's relationship with Fuseli, discussed above. In future editions, Godwin deletes the explicit reference to the *Memoirs* but keeps the quotation, without quotation marks. Godwin's explicit use of the *Memoirs* in the first edition underscores their importance in both his personal development and in his career as a writer; his elision of the reference in subsequent editions, quoting by stealth, similarly illuminates both the savagery of the contemporary reception of his biography and his dilatory response to it.

In the novel, the object of St Leon's obsession, the philosopher's stone, serves to connect his historical milieu of sixteenth-century Europe to Godwin's contemporary, late eighteenth-century Britain, profoundly suspicious of 'modern philosophy'. Gary Kelly also suggests that the destruction of St Leon's alchemical experimentarium deliberately echoes the contemporary trashing of Priestley's scientific laboratory in a spate of mob violence towards threatening 'philosopher' figures in the 1790s.³⁷ Godwin tracks the costs of St Leon's public actions on the private sphere of his conjugal family, representing the dichotomy between private intentions and public reception. In doing so, Godwin reveals a new pessimism towards his earlier belief in unimpeded rational communication, particularly evident in the unreliability of St Leon's narration and his distrust in reading and the reader.

In *St. Leon*, Marguerite De Damville is a deeply unsatisfying fictional representation of Wollstonecraft. Marguerite, identified with Wollstonecraft by Godwin's friend Thomas Holcroft, is a much more conventionally feminine character, although her conversation is imbued with some of Wollstonecraft's searching intellectual ability. Thomas Holcroft wrote to Godwin after *St. Leon*'s publication, making explicit his understanding that Marguerite was based on Wollstonecraft: 'Your Marguerite is inimitable. Knowing the model after which you drew, as often as I recollected it, my heart ached while I read'.³⁸ For modern readers, however, Marguerite reads as a falling-off from Godwin's complex portrait of his late wife in the *Memoirs*. She remains passive, resigned, obedient and supportive throughout St Leon's worst egotistical excesses. Wollstonecraft's active radicalism is consigned to some aspects of Marguerite's conversation. As such, she becomes representative of Godwin's nostalgia for the lost revolutionary moment of the 1790s, and perhaps, the lost revolutionary moment of his love affair with Wollstonecraft. This moment is only addressed in Marguerite's words, never her actions; radical political action remains only a distant, ever more unlikely possibility in her relationship with St Leon. St Leon's first meeting with Marguerite leads to a detailed, almost fetishised description both of her personal appearance and intellectual capabilities. He stresses her femininity at

37 Gary Kelly, *The English Jacobin Novel, 1780–1805* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 210.

38 Quoted in C. Kegan Paul, *William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries*, vol. 2 (1876) (New York: AMC Press, 1970), 25.

the same time as focusing on her physical and intellectual strength: 'Her step was airy and light as that of a young fawn, yet at the same time firm, and indicative of strength of body and vigour of mind ... her understanding was bold and correct' (39). St Leon concludes that Marguerite's 'mind was well furnished with every thing that could add to her accomplishments as a wife or a mother' (39). Godwin's, or at least St Leon's, weak feminism is visible in the above description: Marguerite has a healthy body and mind, but these attributes only fit her as wife and mother, roles which both define and restrict her role in the text. He further erodes any proto-feminist qualities in Marguerite by focusing his admiration on her physical beauty, simplicity, prudence and amiableness.

On the other hand, Godwin recycles his description of his eccentric living arrangements with Wollstonecraft in St Leon's with Marguerite: 'We had each our separate pursuits, whether for the cultivation of our minds, or the promotion of our mutual interests. Separation gave us respectability in each other's eyes, while it prepared us to enter with fresh ardour into society and conversation' (43). His description of St Leon and Marguerite companionably reading together also seems to recall his experience of shared reading with Wollstonecraft:

The terrible, the majestic, the voluptuous and the melting, are all of them, in a considerable degree, affairs of sympathy; and we never judge of them so infallibly, or with so much satisfaction, as when, in the presence of each other, the emotion is kindled in either bosom at the same instant, the eye-beams, pregnant with sentiment and meaning, involuntarily meet and mingle; the voice of the reader becomes modulated by the ideas of his author, and that of the hearer, by an accidental interjection of momentary comment or applause, confesses its accord.

(44)

Reading becomes a form of spiritual, almost sexual, communion between St Leon and Marguerite; their reading matter – Petrarch's Laura, Dante's Beatrice, Eloise and Abelard, and the poetry of the troubadours – all contributes to the idealisation of Marguerite as Wollstonecraft's ghost in the novel.

St Leon's literary utopia does not last long, however. The domestic happiness of the St Leon family is destroyed by his gambling debts, closely followed by his analogical search for the philosopher's stone. He squanders his fortune in Paris, leaving his family destitute and himself temporarily mad with guilt and self-loathing. Offered the secret of eternal youth and infinite riches by a mysterious stranger, St Leon only manages to alienate first his wife, then his son from him, and then he finds himself alienated from the rest of civil society. St Leon's alienation from his family and society triggers a concomitant alienation in his relationship with his readers. Defending himself against the imagined charge of selfishness because he does not impart the secret of immortality to his ailing wife, St Leon addresses the reader directly:

Some readers will perhaps ask me why, anxious as I was for the life of Marguerite, and visible as was the decline of her health, I did not administer to her of the elixir of immortality which was one of my peculiar endowments. Such readers I have only to remind, that the pivot upon which the history I am composing turns, is a mystery. If they will not accept of my communication upon my own terms, they must lay aside my book.

(178)

Godwin shows St Leon's corruption by the philosopher's stone in this movement from reading as a companionable activity in his early relationship with Marguerite to reading as a non-negotiable issue of trust.³⁹ The status of reading falls further as Marguerite's health disintegrates. Describing himself as a 'better and kinder husband' (212) because of Marguerite's ill health, St Leon then admits that, even so, domestic harmony is no longer enough for him, and that he feels compelled to pursue 'chemistry and the operations of natural magic' (213). Godwin makes St Leon's corruption clear when he categorises the 'most imperious passions of the human mind' as 'wealth, power, and pleasurable sensation' (213), focusing on his growing greed and selfishness.

It is in these scenes, first supporting St Leon to get over his gambling addiction, then confronting his secretive pursuit of power, in which Marguerite seems the most authentically Wollstonecraftian. Musing on their fall from high society into a life of labour in rural Switzerland, Marguerite asks St Leon, 'have you done us a mischief, or have you conferred a benefit?' answering herself:

I more than half incline to the latter opinion. Let us at length dismiss artificial tastes, and idle and visionary pursuits, that do not flow in a direct line from any of the genuine principles of our nature! ... What is chivalry, what are military prowess and glory? ... You, like me, are fond of the luxuriant and romantic scenes of nature. Here we are placed in the midst of them.

(77–8)

Marguerite's focus on the natural above the artificial, and dismissal of 'visionary pursuits' and old chivalric codes, echo Wollstonecraft's concerns throughout her published work. She also pinpoints St Leon's continuing psychological problems: his overwhelming need for honour and fame which lead him and his family to destruction.

Marguerite also perceptively deconstructs St Leon's character in his secretive usage of the philosopher's stone to move his family out of honest poverty into the degraded, mercantile society of Constance. Constance itself is described in hauntingly similar terms to Wollstonecraft's climactic experiences in Hamburg in her *Letters from Norway*. Constance exists without 'the politeness, the

39 St Leon's demand for unwarranted trust from his readers also represents Godwin's attempt to fill the plot hole of why his protagonist does not simply give the elixir of immortality to his wife.

elegance, the learning or the genius, an intercourse with which had once been familiar to me. It scarcely contained within its walls any but such as were occupied in merchandise or manufacture' (150). This mirrors Wollstonecraft tracing the cost of commerce on the human soul after her experiences in Hamburg: 'A man ceases to love humanity, and then individuals, as he advances in the chase after wealth'.⁴⁰ Further, in this section, St Leon displays the characteristics of Wollstonecraft's construction of Imlay in her travelogue: greedy, selfish and callous.

Using his mysteriously gotten gains to return to high society, St Leon takes his son Charles on a luxurious tour of the French court. However, as he is unable to give any sensible justification of his new-found wealth, St Leon's lavish behaviour raises suspicions, including those of his son. Incapable of honest dealing with Charles, St Leon finds himself disowned by his son. The degrading effect the pursuit of wealth has had on his character is visible in his plaintive cries: "My son! my son! – wealth! wealth! – my wife! – my son!" (*St. Leon*, 163), echoing Shylock's distressed "My daughter! – O my ducats! – O my daughter!" in *The Merchant of Venice* (Act II, Scene 8). St Leon mixes up family affections with the pursuit of wealth, uncannily connecting him to Shakespeare's usurer.

When St Leon returns to Constance without Charles, Marguerite berates him with the costs of his pursuit of the philosopher's stone on his family: 'You have lost your son; you have lost your honest fame; the life of your Marguerite is undermined and perishing' (174). Again, in a manner reminiscent of Wollstonecraft's correspondence with Imlay, Marguerite savages St Leon:

One thing further let me add. I will speak it, not in the character of a censor, but a friend. It must ever be right and useful, that a man should be undeceived in any erroneous estimate he may make of himself. I have loved you much; I found in you many good qualities; my imagination decorated you in the virtues that you had not; but you have removed the veil. An adept and an alchemist is a low character.

(175)

Marguerite concludes the character evisceration of her husband: 'Equality is the soul of real and cordial society ... How unhappy the wretch, the monster rather let me say, who is without an equal' (176); sentiments imbued with Wollstonecraftian radicalism and, perhaps, providing an early inspiration for Mary Shelley's study in monstrosity, *Frankenstein*.

St Leon sinks ever lower in Marguerite's opinion, so much so that she becomes 'languid, indisposed in body and mind, her thoughts gloomy, her

40 Mary Wollstonecraft, *Letters Written in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (1796) in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 6, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Brooks (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 342.

hopes blasted, her wishes bankrupt' (211). He is imprisoned for the suspected murder and embezzlement of Zampieri, the alchemist who had passed on the secrets of the philosopher's stone to St Leon, and only escapes by bribing his way out. Moving to the Italian countryside, his alchemical practices mean that he is viewed with suspicion by nearby villagers. Increasingly prone to violence, these villagers kill St Leon's dog then burn down his house; his faithful servant Hector dying in the blaze. Gary Kelly argues that Godwin draws deliberate parallels between this act of destruction and the contemporary burning down of Priestley's laboratory in the Birmingham Riots: that for Godwin 'the fate of the adept and the lover of wisdom are the same, both are feared by the ignorant and persecuted by the powerful' (*English Jacobin Novel*, 210).

St Leon had already sent his wife and daughters onwards to Barcelona, but the news of Hector's death has speeded Marguerite towards her own. Giving birth to a stillborn child, she becomes 'reconciled and content to die' (*St. Leon*, 239), demanding that her feckless husband give up the care of his daughters to someone both better suited and more responsible. As soon as St Leon (quickly) agrees, she expires. Marguerite's death, related to childbirth, and negating St Leon's role in the upbringing of his orphaned daughters, shares a series of uneasy echoes with Godwin's account of Wollstonecraft's death and his own concern for the best way to bring up Fanny and Mary.

Apart from a brief reunion with his daughters, during which he remains anonymous, and the weird, quasi-incestuous debacle of his matchmaking efforts on behalf of his son which concludes the novel, St Leon cuts his ties to the domestic affections and goes it alone, being repeatedly imprisoned and misunderstood. St Leon's incarceration by the Spanish Inquisition allows Godwin further scope to link the events of the sixteenth century with the eighteenth:

If these papers of mine are ever produced to light, may it not happen that they shall first be read by a distant posterity, who will refuse to believe that their fathers were ever mad enough to subject each other to so horrible a treatment, merely because they were unable to adopt each other's opinions? Oh, no! human affairs, like the waves of the ocean, are merely in a state of ebb and flow ... two centuries perhaps after Philip the Second shall be gathered to his ancestors [he died in 1598], men shall learn over again to persecute each other for conscience sake.

(275)

In this passage, Godwin uses the widespread vilification of Inquisitorial practices to comment on the contemporary turmoil caused by the French Revolution, and the turn against his own works in the reactionary reception of his *Memoirs* of Wollstonecraft, and the subsequent attacks on his entire corpus. Further, Pamela Clemit notes that 'Godwin's commitment to radical concerns in *St. Leon* is ... fraught with problems: the increased range of his historical

analysis gives rise to heightened scepticism about the fulfilment of progressive ideals, which are viewed either as hopelessly nostalgic, or as open to distortion'.⁴¹ Godwin confronts the distorting effects of nostalgia in *St. Leon*, both in his own nostalgic reformulation of Wollstonecraft in the character of Marguerite and through his analysis of the effect St Leon's memories of his wife have on his ability to act responsibly in public and private. Godwin's treatment of nostalgia, then, is both self-critical and more generally sceptical. Godwin's *Memoirs* of Wollstonecraft provides later writers with a divided representation of the feminist to work with; *St. Leon* demonstrates one way of romanticising Wollstonecraft in fiction. My next chapter explores several women writers' responses to Godwin's romantic representation of his wife. This chapter concludes with Hays's memorialisation of Wollstonecraft, both following and challenging Godwin's.

Passion, reason, imagination: Hays's 'Memoirs of Wollstonecraft'

Hays's own 'Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft', published in Richard Phillips's *Annual Necrology for 1797–1798* (1800), follows Godwin's lead, acts as a corrective to some of his views, and often responds defiantly to the reactionary attacks on Godwin's text and Wollstonecraft's character. Like Godwin, Hays presents Wollstonecraft as an extraordinary woman, gifted with masculine understanding and feminine sensibility: reason and passion inextricably linked together, as in her portrait of the heroine of *Emma Courtney*. In fact, Hays's Wollstonecraft bears more than a passing resemblance to Emma Courtney, and her 'Memoirs' have a similar epistolary structure to her first novel. Hays uses Godwin's publication of Wollstonecraft's letters to Imlay to focus on Wollstonecraft's private self, passionately expressed in these letters, over and above her public discourse.

Hays postulates Wollstonecraft's extraordinary nature as an excuse for the 'extravagance' of her writing and life story:

Vigorous minds are with difficulty restrained within the trammels of authority; a spirit of enterprise, a passion for experiment; a liberal curiosity, urges them to quit the beaten paths, to explore untried ways, to burst the fetters of prescription, and to acquire wisdom by an individual experience.⁴²

Hays develops her private view of Wollstonecraft as a genius, Lavater's 'one in a million', as a defiant apology for the infamous eccentricity of her 'untried' way through life. Barbara Taylor argues that this eulogy for Wollstonecraft is a

41 Pamela Clemit, *The Godwinian Novel: The Rational Fictions of Godwin, Brockden Brown and Mary Shelley* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 94.

42 See Mary Hays, 'Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft' in *Annual Necrology for 1797–1798* (London: Phillips, 1800), 411–60, 411. Subsequent references, in-text as 'Memoirs'.

‘reminder of what Enlightenment could mean to a woman’.⁴³ In her own memoir of her friend, Hays seeks to explain, soften and engage her readers’ sympathies with the woman she recognises from Godwin’s *Memoirs*, attempting to superimpose her own representation of Wollstonecraft over Godwin’s.

Hays both follows and questions Godwin’s treatment of Wollstonecraft’s religious beliefs as ‘almost entirely of her own creation’⁴⁴ and his contention that on her deathbed ‘not one word of a religious cast fell from her lips’ (*Memoirs*, 138) in her depiction of her friend’s religion. Bred ‘in the principles of the church of England’, Wollstonecraft’s religion, according to Godwin, ‘was, in reality, little allied to any system of forms; and, as she has often told me, was founded rather in taste, than in the niceties of polemical discussion’ (*Memoirs*, 96). Godwin’s anxiety to present a vision of Wollstonecraft unanchored by religious doctrine is expressed in his unlikely claim that Wollstonecraft ‘often told me’ (note the assertion of autobiography) she was uninterested in ‘polemical discussion’. Godwin’s later account of his uncomfortable first meeting with Wollstonecraft, in which he was disturbed by her pressing interest in polemics, belies this oversimplification of Wollstonecraft’s religious underpinnings. His depiction of Wollstonecraft taking ‘inexpressible delight in the beauties of nature, and in the splendid reveries of the imagination’, and conclusion that ‘her religion was almost entirely of her own creation’ (96) coincides with his mission to envision his late wife as an exemplar of sensibility, rather than giving any solid account of the religious arguments running through her work. Wollstonecraft’s delight in nature and imaginative engagement with religious ideas also connects her to the later Romantic heroine which her daughter Mary Shelley engages with throughout her work.⁴⁵

Following Godwin, Hays’s Wollstonecraft ‘laid no stress on creeds and forms’ and ‘rested not upon critical evidence or laborious investigation’ but ‘she adored the Creator in the temple of the universe, worshipped him amongst the beauties of nature, or, suffering her mind to expatiate amidst ideas of spotless

43 Barbara Taylor, ‘Feminists versus Gallants: Manners and Morals in Enlightenment Britain’ in *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*, eds. Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007), 30–52, 46.

44 William Godwin, *Memoirs of the Author of ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’* (1798), 138, in *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 1, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992). Subsequent references, in-text.

45 Godwin’s characterisation of Wollstonecraft’s religious beliefs also implicitly aligns her with ‘natural religion’ or deism as opposed to ‘revealed religion’ or theism, as her belief depends on finding evidence of God’s existence in the natural world rather than in ‘revealed’ sources such as the Bible. See J.C.A Gaskin, ‘Hume on Religion’ in *The Cambridge Companion to David Hume*, ed. David Fate Norton (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 313–44, particularly 314–16, for a helpful analysis of the differences between deism and theism, and related eighteenth-century debates. Although Godwin is often called an atheist in both contemporary and modern criticism of his writing, his focus here on nature and the imagination chimes with his own later writing on religious belief, as outlined by Rowland Weston in ‘William Godwin’s Religious Sense’, *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32.3 (2009), 407–23.

purity and boundless goodness, humbled herself before him in the still hour of recollection' ('Memoirs', 416). On her deathbed, Hays's Wollstonecraft is calm and contented, not in the determinedly secular manner according to Godwin but because 'The religious sentiments she had imbibed in her youth, had in them no terrors [sic] that could discompose a dying hour; her imagination had embodied images of visionary perfection, giving rise to affections in which her sensibility delighted to indulge' (457). Comparing Hays's projection of Wollstonecraft's beliefs with Godwin's, Barbara Taylor argues that the latter's 'owes too much to Godwin's own religious scepticism to be wholly reliable' whereas Hays's 'better captures Wollstonecraft's credo', yet both underestimate the centrality of Wollstonecraft's religious beliefs to her feminist philosophy.⁴⁶ Both Godwin and Hays's downplaying of Wollstonecraft's active engagement with religion throughout her work contributes to later, reactionary representations of her as threateningly irreligious.

Hays's analysis of Wollstonecraft's most famous text, her second *Vindication*, also follows Godwin's in her characterisation of its 'perspicuity and arrangement' as 'defective' and 'its style, though frequently rich and glowing ... sometimes inflated, and generally incorrect' ('Memoirs', 423). On the other hand, she defends it against 'the virulence of opposition, the clamours of ignorance, the cavils of superstition, and the misrepresentation of wilful perversion', perhaps remembering the reception of her own texts, arguing that Wollstonecraft's work promises 'a rich and abundant harvest' once 'this ferment has subsided' (423). Again foregrounding Wollstonecraft's melding of traditionally masculine and feminine characteristics, Hays concludes:

The high masculine tone, sometimes degenerating into coarseness, that characterizes this performance, is in a variety of parts softened and blended with a tenderness of sentiment, an exquisite delicacy of feeling, that touches the heart, and takes captive the imagination.

(423)

In her 'Memoirs', Hays turns to Wollstonecraft's private correspondence, made available by Godwin's publication of her letters to Gilbert Imlay amongst her *Posthumous Works*, to exemplify Wollstonecraft's commingling of reason and passion. Quoting extensively from these letters, Hays tracks the progress of Wollstonecraft's love affair with Imlay, from her ecstatic early letters pulsing with pleasure and excitement to the more and more desperate notes leading to her suicide attempts and the eventual dissolution of their relationship. In her selection of Wollstonecraft's correspondence, Hays highlights her friend's 'exquisite' sensibility. One exemplary excerpt berates Imlay for his lack of imagination:

46 Barbara Taylor, 'The Religious Foundations of Mary Wollstonecraft's Feminism' in *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Claudia L. Johnson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 99–118, 101.

Believe me, sage sir, you have not sufficient respect for the imagination – I could prove to you in a trice that it is the mother of sentiment, the great distinction of our nature, the only purifier of the passions ... The impulse of the senses, passions, if you will, and the conclusions of reason, draw men together; but the imagination is the true fire, stolen from heaven, to animate this cold creature of clay, producing all those fine sympathies that lead to rapture ...

(429)

Passion, reason, imagination: Hays uses Wollstonecraft's private correspondence with Imlay to explicate her own philosophical ideals. Walker argues that 'In representing Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Hays validated her own life-in-writing. Her Wollstonecraft evolved to reflect Hays's understanding in changing times. In this way, the two Marys sustained each other'.⁴⁷ Wollstonecraft, so important for Hays's self-presentation in life, became essential, with her death, in sustaining Hays's sense of self represented through her life writing of her friend and mentor. Her image of Wollstonecraft as an ingenious figure, balancing reason and passion, creates an imaginative space for herself to accomplish the same feat. The trajectory of Hays's treatment of the female philosopher figure moves from early pride in the appellation in *Letters and Essays*, growing ambivalence in *Emma Courtney*, to using Wollstonecraft in order to structure her own balancing of reason and passion in her obituaries of her friend and mentor.⁴⁸

Women writers such as Elizabeth Hamilton, Maria Edgeworth, Frances Burney and even Jane Austen adapt the rhetorical strategies Godwin and Hays adopt in their representations of Mary Wollstonecraft, philosophy and the imagination. In my next chapter, I explore Amelia Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth's reworking of Godwin's splitting of Wollstonecraft into a fragmented philosophical heroine of sensibility, arguing that the latter two further caricature Hays's self-representation in order to sort different models of female philosophy into safe and dangerous iterations, with the implicit aim of recuperating Wollstonecraft for a post-revolutionary Britain.

47 Gina Luria Walker, 'The Two Marys: Hays Writes Wollstonecraft' in *Called to Civil Existence: Mary Wollstonecraft's The Rights of Woman*, ed. Enit K. Steiner (Amsterdam: Rodolphi Press, 2014), 49–70.

48 See my 'Feminism in the Footnotes: Wollstonecraft's Ghost in Mary Hays's *Female Biography*' in *Life Writing* 8.3 (September, 2011): 273–85, for a more detailed account of Hays's obituaries of Wollstonecraft, and how she uses them to fuel her monumental work of feminist historiography, which superficially excludes Wollstonecraft, but is everywhere inflected with Wollstonecraftian feminism.

2 The death of the feminist in Amelia Opie's *Adeline Mowbray*, Elizabeth Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers* and Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*

Rewriting *The Wrongs of Woman*

Mary Wollstonecraft's unfinished novel *The Wrongs of Woman; or, Maria* was published by Godwin in his *Posthumous Works by the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*, to coincide with the publication of his *Memoirs* in early 1798. Set in the Gothic location of a lunatic asylum, the novel tells the story of Maria, imprisoned by her perfidious husband in order to extort her inheritance, narrated both in third person in the prison house and in first person in a memoir addressed to Maria's baby daughter. The novel is presented as a series of interlocking narratives; so, alongside Maria's struggles, Wollstonecraft allows Darnford, the novel's ambiguous hero, Jemima, a prison warden and former prostitute, and various women from different social strata to tell their own stories.

Maria is Wollstonecraft's most radical attack against the network of sexual, social, political and economic systems which combine to imprison women. Read as the continuation of *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* promised at the end of Wollstonecraft's feminist polemic, but in fictional form, the novel shares structural parallels with Godwin's own novelised interpretation of *Political Justice*, *Caleb Williams*. There is a wealth of critical material on the novel, analysing its Gothic trappings, radical politics, the semiotics of mother–daughter relationships, psychological undercurrents, and contemporary reception.¹

1 See the first chapter of Eleanor Ty, *Unsex'd Revolutionaries: Five Women Novelists of the 1790s* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), 31–45, for an analysis of Wollstonecraft's use of Gothic tropes in the novel; Tilottama Rajan, 'Wollstonecraft and Godwin: Reading the Secrets of the Political Novel' *Studies in Romanticism* 27.2 (Summer 1988), 221–51, for the novel's engagement with radical politics; Laurie Langbauer, 'An Early Romance: Motherhood and Women's Writing in Mary Wollstonecraft's Novels' in *Romanticism and Feminism*, ed. Anne Mellor (Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1988) on mother–daughter relationships; Mary Poovey's chapters on Wollstonecraft in *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984), 48–113, for an analysis of the psychological pressures at work in the novel; and Vivien Jones, 'Placing Jemima: Women Writers of the 1790s and the Eighteenth-Century Prostitution Narrative' *Women's Writing*

Godwin's publication of *Maria* alongside his *Memoirs* fuelled the Anti-Jacobin campaign besmirching Wollstonecraft's reputation, allowing a reactionary reading of the text as advocating sexual promiscuity. Conservative critics thus conflated Wollstonecraft's radical social critique with a dangerous form of libidinal libertinism which they sought to confine and control. The responses of the women writers I study in this chapter, Amelia Opie, Elizabeth Hamilton and Maria Edgeworth, to Wollstonecraft's feminist thought is filtered through both Hays's and Godwin's memorialising of Wollstonecraft as well as through Wollstonecraft's own unfinished novel – its fragmentary conclusion offering the possibility of rewriting and reimagining it in their own texts. Each of these writers struggled to develop aspects of Wollstonecraft's philosophical thought, whilst disavowing the elements of her biography which attracted reactionary abuse, in the years immediately after Godwin's publication of his biography and Wollstonecraft's *Posthumous Works*. Opie accomplished this by appropriating Wollstonecraft's social critique to unmask the hypocrisy underpinning bourgeois society's treatment of her Wollstonecraftian heroine. Both Hamilton and Edgeworth negotiated Wollstonecraft's posthumous reputation by creating feminist caricatures who act as scapegoats, based more on Hays than Wollstonecraft, allowing these writers to sympathise with Wollstonecraftian arguments more freely. Although these writers approach Wollstonecraft's feminist legacy from different social, political and literary positions, they are each connected by their desire to appropriate elements of her radical philosophy for a post-revolutionary Britain suspicious of 'Jacobin' ideas, sharing a desire for moderate social reform and a critical stance towards the loyalist position.

In the first issue of the *Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine*, *Maria* is interpreted as 'intended to illustrate the doctrines which Mrs W. had attempted to establish in her "Rights of Woman"',² going on to link Wollstonecraft's 'doctrines' with Godwin's. The reviewer sees 'a very great coincidence' between Wollstonecraft's beliefs and 'those inculcated by the philosopher himself, in that part of his "Political Justice" in which he describes the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes, as one of the highest improvements to result from *political justice*!' (91, emphasis in original). The *Anti-Jacobin* subordinates Wollstonecraft's feminist critique of the tyrannies of marriage in *Maria* to Godwin's anti-authoritarian arguments in *Political Justice*, eliding the differences between the couple's political philosophies, demonstrated in their disagreements over the term 'imagination', discussed in Chapter 1, in order to caricature both writers as advocating 'the promiscuous intercourse of the sexes'.

4.2 (1997), 201–20, for an examination of Wollstonecraft's intervention in the discourse about prostitution in *Maria* and the ways in which her work is developed by other women writers.

2 Rev. of *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*, by William Godwin, and *Posthumous Works*, ed. Godwin, *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 1 (July 1798) (London: J. Plymsell et al., 1799), 91. Hereinafter, *Anti-Jacobin*. Subsequent references, in-text.

The review of Wollstonecraft's unfinished novel pinpoints Maria's 'injurious choice of a husband' as the cause of her incarceration in a madhouse by him, ridiculing her imputation that the wrong pertains to 'the unequal state of women in society' (92). The depiction of Jemima is also ridiculed, as the 'occupations' of thief and prostitute 'had sharpened and invigorated her understanding, in such a degree, indeed, as to make her a political philosopher, without the advantage of any other education' (92). The *Anti-Jacobin* presents Wollstonecraft's rights of woman as the right to promiscuous intercourse, concluding with an analysis of *Maria's* trial scene: 'On the trial, the judge [England being the scene] retains the old system of morals, and does not admit Maria's plea of her feelings as a vindication of her adultery, however conformable it may be to the new philosophy' (93, parentheses in original). The review's description of Jemima as a 'political philosopher' and sarcastic swipe at 'the new philosophy' clearly aligns it with the counter-revolutionary attack on the female philosopher, and more broadly against the network of radicals the *Anti-Jacobin* defines itself against. This review leads directly into the savage critique of Godwin's *Memoirs*, linking Wollstonecraft's perceived immorality in print with her private behaviour: 'Godwin has laboured to inform the world, that the theory of Mrs Wollstonecraft was reduced to practice, that she lived and acted, as she wrote and taught' (93). The *Anti-Jacobin's* attack on Wollstonecraft's theory and practice foreshadows the way in which the three novels studied in this chapter interrogate the theoretical framework and practical application of Wollstonecraft's radical politics.

Amelia Opie, Elizabeth Hamilton and Maria Edgeworth have all been positioned as Anti-Jacobin writers, although recent criticism has challenged this placement, particularly in Opie and Edgeworth's case. Each writer's political position remains open to interpretation, both in relation to the particular text under discussion here and over the course of their career, although I argue that they all occupy a position on the liberal spectrum, from progressive to moderate. Norwich-born Amelia Opie (1769–1853) took on a range of roles over her long life, from society hostess with her shorter-lived husband, the Cornish painter John Opie (1761–1801), to poet and novelist, to Quaker. Over the course of her life, she shifted from a position sympathetic to, if somewhat sceptical of, the radicalism of Wollstonecraft, Godwin and other English Jacobins, to one which Anne McWhir argues was closer to evangelical reformers such as Hannah More. McWhir describes Opie's movement 'away from Revolution-era radicalism ... towards quieter values, belief in social consensus, and an emphasis on personal religious conviction as a motivation for reform'.³ Opie's slow conversion to Quakerism underscores this development. Opie finally joined the Society of Friends in 1825, but was closely involved with them throughout her adult life, corresponding with several prominent members of the group in Norwich, and showing their influence in the character of Mrs Pemberton in *Adeline Mowbray*. However, her status as a poet and novelist clashed with the religious beliefs of

3 Anne McWhir, 'Introduction' to *Adeline Mowbray* (Ontario: Broadview, 2010), 31.

the Quakers, who discouraged imaginative endeavour – perhaps explaining the hesitancy of Opie's conversion. Opie's writing, in any case, is characterised by a wide-ranging, uneasy ambivalence: about the potential of radicalism to ameliorate society, about conservatism's ability to combat vice, about the tensions between fiction and faithfulness.

Elizabeth Hamilton (1756–1816) was born in Ireland but brought up, after the death of her father, in Scotland. Claire Grogan describes Hamilton as 'a liberal writer who sits midway between the two positions [of loyalist Anti-Jacobin and radical English Jacobin]'.⁴ However, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* is the closest to the conservative position of the three novels discussed here, including straightforward defences of British military and imperial policy and advocacy for women's domestic role within the private sphere. Hamilton's satirical first novel, *Translations of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* (1796), uses the perspective of an Indian tourist in Britain to both criticise British morals at home and defend orientalist policy abroad. *Modern Philosophers* (1800) attacks works by Godwin and Hays, whilst briefly defending Wollstonecraft's writing. Her last novel, *The Cottagers of Glenburnie* (1808) argues for the improvement of working and living conditions in working-class Scotland. This novel also sees her borrowing the name Mrs Mason for her main character, an angelic busy-body, from Wollstonecraft's early didactic collection of short stories, *Original Stories from Real Life*, further underscoring her shared educational programme with Wollstonecraft in her description of female education at the end of the novel. She also published a range of other educational treatises.

Maria Edgeworth (1768–1849) was a prolific Anglo-Irish novelist, who also published poetry, short stories, children's fiction, and educational treatises, sometimes in collaboration with her polymath father Richard Lovell Edgeworth. She was one of the most popular writers of the early nineteenth century, her work easily eclipsing both sales and the critical reception of the lesser-known Jane Austen and inspiring the historical fiction of Walter Scott. Like Austen, she has been categorised as a conservative, if not simply Anti-Jacobin, writer, most influentially by Marilyn Butler, although twenty-first-century criticism, especially Cliona Ó Gallchoir's definitive critical biography, has repositioned her as more liberal, challenging and subversive.⁵ Each of these writers, coming from different backgrounds and on different political trajectories, share an interest in appropriating elements of Wollstonecraft's radical philosophy to forward arguments for moderate social reform in a post-revolutionary context.

4 Claire Grogan, 'Introduction' to *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (Ontario: Broadview, 2000), 12.

5 See Marilyn Butler, *Maria Edgeworth: A Literary Biography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972) for Butler's influential positioning of Edgeworth as a conservative writer, heavily influenced by the politics of her father, and Cliona Ó Gallchoir, *Maria Edgeworth: Women, Enlightenment and Nation* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2005), for an analysis of Edgeworth's more complex relationship both to contemporary political movements in Ireland, Britain and the wider world, and her father's ideas.

All three writers are mentioned in Matthew Grenby's *The Anti-Jacobin Novel* as examples of authors of conservative texts. He argues that 'however ambiguous the political stance of its author, [Adeline Mowbray] could only have been interpreted by the majority of her contemporaries as an inquest into both the practicalities and morality of cohabitation without marriage', stating that 'the novel itself returned a decisive [conservative] verdict on both counts'.⁶ Although Grenby adds a qualifier about Opie's own ambiguous politics, he situates her novel as straightforwardly Anti-Jacobin. He also describes Hamilton as an author of novels with 'an anti-Jacobin tendency' (*The Anti-Jacobin Novel*, 184) and positions Edgeworth's work as 'broadly Anti-Jacobin' (212). I argue that Opie and Edgeworth's politics are much more complex, as they critique both radical and conservative positions, revealing the impracticality of the former and the hypocrisy of the latter, aligning them with the reformist politics shared by writers as diverse as Godwin and Austen (discussed in Chapters 1 and 3, respectively). Hamilton's position may be more conservative, at least in *Modern Philosophers*, but she is the only one of the three to directly defend Wollstonecraft's writing, if only briefly and in a deliberately limited fashion. I argue that this defence of Wollstonecraft is enabled, even as it is curtailed, by her more explicitly conservative politics.

Each of these authors was writing in a post-revolutionary context, at the beginning of the Napoleonic Wars, when the Pitt government was again cracking down on dissent, and at a time when loyalist publications such as the *Anti-Jacobin* were at the forefront of demands for patriotic compliance. Their engagement with Wollstonecraft's politics and philosophy is, of necessity, circumspect, as the more conservative climate of the early nineteenth century, of which the *Anti-Jacobin* was an extreme manifestation, discouraged active support for radicalism, now linked to both the revolutionary violence of 1790s France and the more immediate military enmity with Napoleon. Nevertheless, Opie's *Adeline Mowbray* (1805), Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800) and Edgeworth's *Belinda* (1801) each represent an attempt to respond to *Maria*, as well as Wollstonecraft's theory and practice, life and writing. These responses needed to negotiate the reactionary response to Wollstonecraft which troped her life as prostituted and writings as politically dangerous, at the same time as each author strove to utilise Wollstonecraft's thought to inform their own feminist aims. Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth's novels, therefore, seem suspicious of putting theory into practice, and hinge on the difficulties inherent in interpretation.

This suspicion of theory seems to align these writers with Edmund Burke's critique of the speculative nature of proponents of the rights of men. In *Reflections on the Revolution in France*, Burke warns:

Against these their [the French revolutionaries'] rights of men let no government look for security in the length of its continuance, or in the

6 Matthew Grenby, *The Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Conservatism and the French Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 89.

justice and lenity of its administration. The objections of these speculatists, if its forms do not quadrate with its theories, are as valid against such an old and beneficent government as against the most violent tyranny, or the greenest usurpation.⁷

He argues that the theoretical nature of the rights of men can be used to attack legitimate as well as illegitimate government, going on to redefine the rights of men as the right to defend property, inheritance and wealth because ‘all men have equal rights; but not to equal things’ (*Reflections*, 59). However, Opie, Edgeworth and, to a lesser extent, Hamilton each critique the ‘old and beneficent’ government of Britain, revealing the damage done to women and other marginalised social groups by this Burkean defence of inequality.

‘What charming things would sublime theories be’:

Adeline Mowbray

Adeline Mowbray has been read since its publication as Opie’s fictionalised analysis of both the relationship between her former friends Wollstonecraft and Godwin and of the interconnection of Wollstonecraft’s philosophical principles with her life and death.⁸ With the notable exception of Matthew Grenby, discussed above, there is a growing critical consensus in feminist literary criticism that the novel, whilst gesturing towards the conventions of the Anti-Jacobin novel, presents a much more nuanced, psychologically and socio-politically astute understanding of the difficulties of contravening conventional mores as a woman. Eleanor Ty pioneers this interpretation of *Adeline Mowbray*, arguing that Opie’s novels are deliberately ‘ambiguous and open to dialogical readings’.⁹ I argue that the ambiguity Ty perceives in the novel is part of Opie’s characteristic ambivalence, balanced between her sympathy for the radicalism of her friends’ Wollstonecraft and Godwin and her more pragmatic concern for social stability. Focusing on the colonial implications of Opie’s social satire, Katie Trumpener argues that *Adeline Mowbray* ‘strives to link the causes of gradual abolition and moderate feminism and to disengage both causes from a Jacobinism that has, among its other misdeeds, betrayed abolitionist and feminist

7 Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), ed. L.G. Mitchell (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 58. Subsequent references, in-text.

8 Contemporary reviews noted Opie’s allusions to Wollstonecraft’s biography in her novel, reading them approvingly as critical of radical politics. For example, the *Monthly Review* 2nd series, 51 (Nov 1806), 320–1, reads the novel as portraying ‘the lamentable consequences, which would result from an adoption of some lax principles relative to a rejection of matrimonial forms, which have been inculcated by certain modern writers’. Roxanne Eberle traces the changing appreciation of Opie’s allusions to Wollstonecraft in ‘Diverting the Libertine Gaze; or, The Vindication of the Fallen Woman’ *Studies in the Novel* 26 (1994), 121–52.

9 Eleanor Ty, *Empowering the Feminine: The Narratives of Mary Robinson, Jane West and Amelia Opie, 1796–1812* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), 9. See also her chapter on the novel, 145–60.

interests'.¹⁰ I focus on the way in which Opie adapts Wollstonecraft's earlier feminism, rather than disengaging from it, in order to develop her own critique of societal hypocrisy, including the treatment of colonial possessions, such as slaves and black servants. I am therefore building on Roxanne Eberle's contention that Opie undercuts the seemingly conservative didacticism of Adeline's dying moments by stressing Adeline's innate virtue as opposed to the vicious social hypocrisy surrounding her.¹¹ In my reading, Wollstonecraft's novel, *Maria*, as much as her life story, serves as a complex intertext for *Adeline Mowbray*, allowing Opie to access Wollstonecraft's radical critique of the status quo, at the same time as exploring the personal costs of resisting it.

Opie traces the personal and public costs of living on the margins of society at the same time as utilising Wollstonecraft's critique of socio-sexual hypocrisy to reveal the ways in which patriarchy marginalises women in the first place. In this way, Wollstonecraft's eccentric life story is abjured whilst Opie struggles to justify her own interpretation of Wollstonecraft's radical critique of social mores. Throughout *Adeline Mowbray*, Opie focuses on the difficulties inherent in interpretation itself: her characters make various misjudgements when reading texts, other characters and social situations; they struggle to remain true to their interpretative theories in practice, faced with hypocrisy, double-dealing and deceit; and Opie makes reading the relationship between theory and practice a serious interpretative issue for her contemporary readers, and for critics today.

Of the three novelists studied in this chapter only Opie knew Wollstonecraft personally, becoming close friends after the latter's return from Scandinavia. Upon the publication of Wollstonecraft's *Letters from Sweden*, the young Amelia Alderson, later Opie, wrote to her: 'I remember the time when my desire of seeing you was repressed by fear – but as soon as I read your letters from Norway, the cold awe which the philosopher has excited, was lost in the tender sympathy called forth by the woman'.¹² Alderson responds to Wollstonecraft's authorial persona here in much the same way as Godwin would do in his *Memoirs*: expressing anxiety over Wollstonecraft's self-construction in her *Vindication* as a philosopher but seduced by the mature self-presentation of her travelogue. In this letter, she also separates Wollstonecraft's status as a philosopher from considerations of her gender, revealing her anxieties about the term 'female philosopher' expressed in more detail in *Adeline Mowbray*.

Only one letter from Wollstonecraft to Alderson survives, from a version published in Cecilia Brightwell's ultra-conservative biography of Amelia Opie.

10 Katie Trumpener, *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 181.

11 Roxanne Eberle, *Chastity and Transgression in Women's Writing, 1792–1897: Interrupting the Harlot's Progress* (London: Palgrave, 2002), 133.

12 Quoted in Claire Tomalin, *The Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft* (1974) (London: Penguin, 2004), 239. There is a need for a scholarly edition of Amelia Opie's letters, spanning the revolutionary tumult of the 1790s into the post-revolutionary era, and offering an insight into religious conversion, Quakerism and women's writing in the early nineteenth century.

Brightwell describes Wollstonecraft as a 'strange incomprehensible woman'¹³ and does her best to distance Opie from the Jacobin friends of her youth. I argue that Opie was closer to Wollstonecraft and Godwin than Brightwell allows, although she maintained a characteristically satirical distance to her friends's political principles, as evidenced in her letter about their marriage (discussed further below). Wollstonecraft's letter is particularly revealing in the light of Opie's later novel as Wollstonecraft details in it the growing social difficulties she faced in her marriage to Godwin, which made it obvious that her earlier relationship with Gilbert Imlay had been conducted out of wedlock, revealing their daughter to be illegitimate. These included sneers from the actress and playwright Elizabeth Inchbald who promised to send congratulations 'the next time he [Godwin] was married', alluding to the abrupt break with Godwin's previous anti-marital philosophy, and the end of her friendship with the Twisses who broke off the relationship upon Wollstonecraft's marriage to Godwin. Wollstonecraft dismisses Inchbald's pointed comment as 'Nonsense!', but is saddened by the Twisses' decision to break off their relationship.¹⁴ Whereas Godwin ridicules the pettiness of these and other social snubs in his *Memoirs*, Opie makes them the focus of Adeline's relationship with Glenmurray in her novel.

Opie also uses Wollstonecraft's forthright views in her letter about putting her theories into practice throughout *Adeline Mowbray*. Dismissing the Twisses' painful rejection, Wollstonecraft writes: 'my conduct in life must be directed by my own judgement and moral principles'. She states that 'it is my wish that Mr Godwin should visit and dine out as formerly, and I shall do the same; in short, I still mean to be independent, even to the cultivating sentiments and principles in my children's minds, (should I have more,) which he disavows' (*Collected Letters*, 409). Wollstonecraft's focus on her own principles and independence inspires Opie's characterisation of Adeline, at least in the early sections of the novel.

In a letter to a friend musing on Wollstonecraft and Godwin's recent marriage, Opie makes this cheerfully cynical comment: 'Heighho! what charming things would sublime theories be, if one could make one's practice keep up with them; but I am convinced it is impossible, and am resolved to make the best of everyday nature' (Opie, quoted in *Memorials of the Life of Amelia Opie*, 59). Her teasing focus here on the difficulty of aligning theory with practice, against 'everyday nature', is subjected in her second novel to a much darker and more ambiguous treatment. The Wollstonecraftian Adeline Mowbray and Godwinian Glenmurray's 'sublime theories' are tested to absolute destruction by the *worst* of 'everyday nature': societal hypocrisy, sexual innuendo and abuse. Playing theory off against practice seems to align Opie with Anti-Jacobin attacks which

13 Cecilia Brightwell, *Memorials of the Life of Amelia Opie* (London: Fletcher and Alexander, 1854), 59. Subsequent references, in-text.

14 *The Collected Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd (London: Penguin, 2004), 408–9. Subsequent references, in-text.

viewed Wollstonecraft and Godwin's sexual practices, depicted as wanton, promiscuous and socially destructive in the reactionary press, as stemming from their radical political and philosophical theories. However, Opie complicates her critique of Wollstonecraftian theory and practice by contrasting Adeline's virtuous interpretation of Glenmurray's theories throughout her life with the duplicitous immorality of both theory and practice in England's high society.

Adeline's single-minded pursuit of her radical philosophy in favour of libertarian equality alienates her jealous mother, subjects her to lewd sexual advances, contributes to the miscarriage of her first child, and weakens her ailing lover, leading to his early death. On the other hand, her marriage to Berrendale, Glenmurray's brutish cousin, sinks her into depression and indirectly leads to her own death. Berrendale, who has already in his earlier life absconded with a West Indian plantocratic heiress, runs away from the ever more angelic Adeline into the arms of another colonial beauty in Jamaica. Adeline's legal pursuit of legitimacy for her abandoned daughter leads to her unhappy reunion with the venal servant Mary, now the mistress of Adeline's lascivious lawyer, who infects her with smallpox. Adeline later dies from complications relating to the disease, although her death is at least partly self-willed.

Opie begins the novel with an account of Adeline's erratic education, remodelling Godwin's account of Wollstonecraft's haphazard childhood by adding to it a Sterne-like comic twist. Adeline's mother, like Walter Shandy, is engaged in writing an educational treatise, which, in her case, she hopes will make her 'a pattern of imitation to mothers'.¹⁵ Opie satirises Mrs Mowbray's decision to restrict Adeline's diet to 'pudding without butter [and] potatoes without salt' whilst 'her own table was covered with viands fitted for the appetite of opulence', by having her servants feed Adeline 'some of the good things set by from Mrs Mowbray's dinner' (*Adeline Mowbray*, 44). Mrs Mowbray's dietary theory might be virtuous, but her practice is hypocritical, and her servants' disobedience is only revealed by Adeline's blushes when her mother boasts of the 'excellent effects of a vegetable diet!' (44). The first chapter closes with Mrs Mowbray's decision to buy Adeline shoes in spite of conflicting theoretical opinions on the matter. She is decided less by sympathy for Adeline holding up her bleeding toes and crying bitterly than the sight of blood on the 'new Turkey carpet', concluding that 'a little experience is better than a great deal of theory' (45). Even here, Mrs Mowbray only becomes pragmatic in order to care for her fashionable furniture rather than her daughter.

Mrs Mowbray takes the first 15 years of her daughter's life to perfect her educational theories. Meanwhile, Adeline is fed by her servants and taught lessons in domestic housework and economy by her grandmother, Mrs Woodville. Opie emphasises the practical nature of Adeline's maternal grandmother against the theoretical interests of her mother, having Mrs Woodville school Adeline in domestic affairs from making pastry to giving alms to the poor to taking care of

15 Amelia Opie, *Adeline Mowbray* (1805), ed. Anne McWhir (Peterborough: Broadview, 2010), 44. Subsequent references, in-text.

the household accounts: all of which are ignored by Mrs Mowbray. After her grandmother's death, Adeline is left at liberty to engage in the philosophical studies which have exalted her mother's reputation for genius but rendered her all but useless in the everyday running of her household. Adeline decides to pursue her mother's 'passion for abstruse speculations', but with a crucial difference: whereas 'these new theories ... only served to amuse Mrs Mowbray's fancy, her more enthusiastic daughter resolved to make [them] conscientiously the rules of her practice' (52). Opie complicates the usual Anti-Jacobin critique of radical theory and practice here by making it clear that Mrs Mowbray's interest in philosophy is merely an affectation, whereas Adeline attempts to honestly engage with these new ideas in her everyday life.

Rather than getting carried away by tales of romance and chivalry, Adeline quixotically decides to base her behaviour on the works of one philosopher, Glenmurray, who:

attacked the institution of marriage; and after having elaborately pointed out its folly and its wickedness, he drew so delightful a picture of the superior purity, as well as happiness, of an union cemented by no ties but those of love and honour, that Adeline, wrought to the highest pitch of enthusiasm for a new order of things, entered into a solemn compact with herself to act, when she was introduced into society, according to the rules laid down by this writer.

(52)

In this sophisticated *roman à clef* on Wollstonecraft's life and work, Opie subordinates her Wollstonecraftian character's philosophy to her Godwinian character's *style* of writing: Adeline is seduced by 'the fatal fascination' of Glenmurray's style, conveying her 'from the world as it is, into a world as it *ought* to be' (52).

This depreciation of Adeline's principles as an intellectually inferior offshoot of Glenmurray's stylish radicalism links Opie's heroine to the Anti-Jacobin representation of Wollstonecraft as an unthinking follower of Godwin's political philosophy, as in the *Anti-Jacobin* magazine's review of her posthumous novel, *Maria*. On the other hand, after Adeline meets Glenmurray, the couple fall in love and run away to Europe, it is Adeline who remains true to her philosophical beliefs, maintaining that her contempt for marriage in favour of 'free love' is entirely rational against Glenmurray's hypocritical recantation of his principles, in favour of a more socially acceptable marriage to Adeline. In a complex *volte face*, Opie presents Glenmurray's Godwinian principles as lacking a firm basis in contrast to the Wollstonecraftian Adeline's continuing fidelity to her radical philosophical system.

Upon Glenmurray's unexpected proposal after the couple's flight to Lisbon, Adeline asks her lover 'whether he had convinced himself that what he had written against marriage was a tissue of mischievous absurdity', to which Glenmurray 'blushing, with the conceit of an author replied "that he still

thought his arguments unanswerable” (102). Adeline then remonstrates with him, ‘if you still are convinced that your theory is good, why let your practice be bad?’ To which Glenmurray replies that he would rather save Adeline the hurt of being thought a kept mistress than remain true to his principles. Adeline retorts with a common trope in Anti-Jacobin mock-Godwinian debate: ‘I ... am entirely out of the question: you are to be governed by no other law but your desire to promote general utility, and are not to think at all of the interest of an individual’ (102). Adeline’s defence of ‘general utility’ against ‘the interest of an individual’ aligns her with the Anti-Jacobin reading of Godwin’s *Political Justice*: she denigrates the domestic affections in favour of a more abstract understanding of justice and morality, defined as ‘modern’ or ‘new’ by its critics. Like other satirists of Godwin’s writing, Opie focuses on the original edition of *Political Justice*, ignoring the recalibration of his views on private life in his *Memoirs of Wollstonecraft*, and later editions of his political polemic. However, Opie subtly plays off Adeline’s principles against Glenmurray’s sense of propriety, revealing both Adeline’s Jacobin-inspired prejudices and the hypocritical sense of social convention underlying her erstwhile philosopher’s pretentious theories. Opie’s satire is double-edged here, levelled against both Godwin’s abstract theories and societal double standards.

Adeline, however, remains true to her principles, even after she is confronted by the full weight of social convention in her treatment at the hands of Glenmurray’s friends and relations, who all assume Adeline is his corrupt mistress. After Glenmurray’s cousins snub her whilst visiting the philosopher out of titillated curiosity, Adeline retires to her room to brood over his behaviour: ‘he had never once expressed a desire of combating their prejudices ... he was contented to do homage to “things as they are”, without an effort to resist the prejudice to which he was superior’ (157), demanding, ‘Alas! ... when can we hope to see society enlightened and improved, when even those who see and strive to amend its faults in theory, in practice tamely submit to the trammels which it imposes?’ (158). With complex irony, Opie makes Adeline act as a mouthpiece for her suspicions about the practicality of ‘sublime theories’, by mimicking revolutionary arguments in favour of enlightenment against prejudice. At the same time, she voices a genuine concern for the upholding of principles in the face of social propriety, revealed to be venal prejudice. Opie’s satire on radical theory and practice is directed more towards Godwin than Wollstonecraft here, with a deft allusion to his novel *Things As They Are; or, The Adventures of Caleb Williams*, and a critique of subordinating radical principle to socially acceptable practice, developed from her letter spoofing the Godwins’ marriage.

In a narratorial aside, Opie reveals to her readers, but not to Adeline or Glenmurray, that both cousins live more sinfully than Adeline, whom they have snubbed, but conceal their behaviour under a veil of social acceptability:

One of them was married, and to so accommodating a husband, that his wife’s known gallant was his intimate friend; and under the sanction of his protection she was received every where, and visited by every one, as the

world did not think proper to be more clear-sighted than the husband himself chose to be. The other lady was a young and attractive widow, who coquetted with many men, but intrigued with only one at a time; for which self-denial she was rewarded by being allowed to pass unquestioned through the portals of fashionable society.

(158)

Opie's careful irony in this episode balances sympathy for Adeline's distress at being scorned by Glenmurray's relations, her own scorn for Glenmurray's failure to defend his lover, and a searing criticism of fashionable society's hypocrisy. This society's treatment of the two sisters reveals its problematic relationship towards propriety: the refusal of 'the world' to be more clear-sighted than the first sister's husband is only 'proper' in the sense that it upholds the appearance of decorum at the expense of its reality; the second sister's 'self-denial' is Opie's scornful code for her immorality, her reward reveals high society's imbrication in vice.

This sequence, in which Opie contrasts Adeline's real virtue, even though she lives outside of society's mores, with the disguised vice of Glenmurray's relations, supported by social hypocrisy, has a direct precursor in Wollstonecraft's *Maria*. After Maria and Darnford have escaped from the lunatic asylum and taken a lodging together, Maria discovers on a visit to 'some ladies with whom she had formerly been intimate' that she is refused admittance because of her new living arrangements. Wollstonecraft adds:

Among these ladies there were some, not her most intimate acquaintance, who were generally supposed to avail themselves of the cloke [sic] of marriage, to conceal a mode of conduct, that would ever have damned their fame, had they been innocent, seduced girls. These particularly stood aloof.¹⁶

In her later novel, Opie combines Wollstonecraft's own painful experiences of social exclusion after her marriage to Godwin with Wollstonecraft's angry fictionalised satire on socially sanctioned vice to create Adeline's sense of exile.

Adeline's beliefs are sorely tested by her mother's disavowal of their relationship, her own miscarriage, and society's dismissal of her as Glenmurray's kept mistress. They begin to break down when Glenmurray, on his death bed, extracts a promise from Adeline to marry his cousin, Berrendale. This mismatched marriage not only deconstructs Adeline's belief in her egalitarian system but acts as Opie's subtly modulated critique of the system of marriage in the late eighteenth century, which strips women of their independence and agency, and leaves them at the mercy of their husbands for social recognition and individual

16 Mary Wollstonecraft, *The Wrongs of Woman; or, Maria* (1798) in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol 1, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 176. Subsequent references, in-text as *Maria*.

meaning. As Eleanor Ty points out (*Empowering the Feminine*, 155), Opie reverses Wollstonecraft's disastrous extra-marital affair with Gilbert Imlay and more successful married experiment with Godwin in Adeline's happy although unmarried relationship with the philosophical Glenmurray and painfully troubled marriage to the brutish Berrendale. By reversing Wollstonecraft's real life experiences in the fictional world of *Adeline Mowbray*, Opie problematises her seeming condemnation of Wollstonecraft's life by presenting Adeline's extra-marital relationship as more successful than her marriage, using this later relationship with Berrendale to criticise the social institution of wedlock.

Opie uses her own early experience of marriage with the Cornish painter John Opie to depict Adeline's with Berrendale. In her biography of John Opie, Ada Earland reports that the painter 'exercised the most rigid economy in his household', suggesting that tensions arose due to Amelia Opie's fondness for 'dress and gaiety' and concluding that these were resolved by John Opie encouraging her literary ambitions.¹⁷ Opie's novel contains a dark reflection of this situation. For the first six months, Adeline and Berrendale's marriage seems to be a success:

But Berrendale awoke from this dream of bliss, on finding to what a large sum the bills for the half-year's housekeeping amounted. Adeline, more eager to gratify Berrendale's palate than considerate as to the means, had forgotten that she was no longer at the head of a liberal establishment like her mother's, and had bought for the supply of the table many expensive articles.

(*Adeline Mowbray*, 205)

Adeline's attempts to economise by going without herself, whilst providing her husband with the rich foods to which he had become accustomed, pass unobserved by the gluttonous Berrendale. Furthermore, he refuses to introduce her to his friends, preferring to leave her at home with her faithful servant, Savanna, and child. It later transpires that he has passed her off to his friends and family as his kept mistress. In despair, Adeline's only refuge is to begin to write hymns. Opie's use of her own marital difficulties in *Adeline Mowbray* complicates the simplistic reduction of the novel to a *roman à clef* about Wollstonecraft, underscoring the authorial sympathy directed towards her protagonist.

This marriage affords Opie the scope to analyse a (mis)match in which incommensurability of character turns the man into a tight-fisted brute and the woman into a resigned wretch. Musing on how the dead Glenmurray could ever have thought Berrendale a match for Adeline, Opie ironises: 'Adeline forgot that the faults of her husband were such as could be known only by an intimate connexion, and which cohabitation could alone call forth ...' (209). This passage shows her debt not only to Wollstonecraft but also to Godwin's *Political Justice* in which he argues that cohabitation renders men and women

17 Ada Earland, *John Opie and His Circle* (London: Hutchinson & Co., 1911), 131.

feeble, jealous and irrational.¹⁸ Shortly after her marriage, Adeline realises that she 'is united for life to a being whose sluggish sensibilities could not understand, and consequently not soothe, the quick feelings and jealous susceptibility of her nature' (214). In despair, the more and more angelic Adeline falls at the feet of the bestial Berrendale, an action which this unlikely hero thinks is 'a confession of her weakness and his superiority' (214). Berrendale's brutishness does not take the form of physical violence towards his wife; instead, he inflicts a subtler and perhaps more soul-destroying punishment on Adeline: his callous indifference to her thoughts and feelings being felt as an emotional and psychic attack on his wife's sensibilities.

Adeline Mowbray may be Opie's 'treatise against free love'¹⁹ but it also functions in a much more subversive way to undermine the institution of marriage. When Berrendale departs for Jamaica, Adeline tries to feel 'such sorrow as the tenderness which he had expressed at the moment of parting seemed to make it her duty to feel' but 'morning came, and with it a feeling of liberty and independence so delightful, that she no longer tried to grieve on speculation as it were' (217). Those revolutionary terms, liberty and independence, so important to Opie's old friend Wollstonecraft, underscore the delicate nature of Opie's examination of love and marriage in the early nineteenth century. Marriage is revealed to be at least as destructive to Adeline's happiness as living outside society's conventions turned out to be for Glenmurray's health.²⁰

The conclusion of the novel is taken up with two recantations of Adeline's anti-marital philosophy, both to her well-meaning, if sinful, suitor Colonel Mordaunt. The first is half-hearted to say the least:

I have no doubt that there is a great deal of individual suffering in the marriage state, from contrariety of temper and other causes; but I believe that the mass of happiness and virtue is certainly increased by it. Individual suffering, therefore, is no argument for the abolition of marriage, than the accidental bursting of a musket would be for the total abolition of fire-arms.

(*Adeline Mowbray*, 238)

Adeline's half-hearted recantation here connects the institution of marriage to the possession of fire-arms, linking marriage to something potentially dangerous and life-threatening, however difficult to abolish. In answer to Mordaunt's 'What can have so completely changed your opinions on this subject?' Adeline

18 See the Appendix 'Of Co-operation, Cohabitation and Marriage' in William Godwin, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice* (1793), vol. 3. *The Political and Philosophical Writings of William Godwin*, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1993).

19 Kenneth Neill Cameron, ed. *Romantic Rebels: Essays on Shelley and His Circle*, vol. 2 (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1961), 840.

20 See my 'Beauties and Beasts: Alderson, Wollstonecraft, Godwin, Opie' *Royal Institution of Cornwall Journal* 2009, 41–50, for a more detailed account of Opie's blend of autobiography and biography in *Adeline Mowbray*.

answers, 'Not my own experience ... for the painful situations in which I have been placed, I might attribute, not to the fallacy of the system on which I have acted, but to those existing prejudices in society which I wish to see destroyed' (238). In this statement, Adeline defends her philosophical principles in favour of equal relations between men and women against contemporary standards of feminine propriety which subordinate women to men, characterising this false sense of decorum, just as Wollstonecraft did, as societal prejudice. Adeline's second recantation totally rejects these equivocations. Now, she argues that without marriage 'unbridled licentiousness would soon be in general practice' (256), and that children would therefore either 'die the victims of neglect, and the very existence of the human race be threatened; or, without morals or instruction, they would grow up to scourge the world by their vices, till the whole fabric of civilized society was gradually destroyed' (256). She wants to die in order to become 'an awful warning' to her daughter, 'a melancholy proof of the dangers which attend a deviation from the path of virtue' (256).

Adeline dies, and seems to redeem with her providential final words, 'I thank thee, gracious Heaven!' (283), the more secular manner of Wollstonecraft's death as told in Godwin's *Memoirs*: 'during her whole illness, not one word of a religious cast fell from her lips'.²¹ Like Hays in her 'Memoirs' of Wollstonecraft, Opie recasts Godwin's secular portrayal of his wife's fate with a more religious conclusion to her Wollstonecraftian heroine's life. Opie also rewrites Godwin's suggested conclusion to *The Wrongs of Woman*, in which Maria is interrupted by Jemima in a suicide attempt and reunited with the daughter she thought was dead. Maria embraces the child and 'then exclaimed: "The conflict is over! I will live for my child!"' (*Maria*, 184). Opie contrasts this possible conclusion to Wollstonecraft's unfinished novel with Adeline's determination to die, in order to act as a warning for her daughter on the consequences of choosing to live outside society's boundaries.

Adeline dies surrounded by what Anne Mellor describes as her 'reconstituted family of choice, composed of an upper class British woman, a middle class Quaker woman, and a working class freed African slave woman'.²² Roxanna Eberle also sees the utopian possibilities of the feminine space constructed by Opie at the end of *Adeline Mowbray*, but concludes her article on a much more sceptical note. For Eberle, Rosevalley's feminotopia signifies a retreat into domesticity, easily co-opted into a narrative cementing women's position in the private sphere of hearth and home. Moreover, Opie, and Mellor's, proto-feminist utopia depends for its construction on the death of the novel's female philosopher and central protagonist, Adeline – further, it hinges on Adeline's explicit repudiation of her feminist philosophy on her deathbed.

21 William Godwin, *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*, in *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 1, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992), 138.

22 Mellor, Anne K. 'Were Women Writers "Romantics"?' *Modern Language Quarterly* 62.4 (December 2001), 403.

Unfortunately for Mellor's utopian reading of the novel, the feminist space that she sees in the ending of *Adeline Mowbray* is founded on the protagonist's death. Adeline's death not only obviously curtails her Jacobin philosophy but also brings into question the possibilities for moderate feminism in a world marked by spite, hypocrisy and brutality. Rather than embodying the future salvation of the British political public sphere, this exclusionary utopia questions its lasting legitimacy. Remodelling Wollstonecraft's radical life and thought into the tragic Adeline's quixotic pursuit of her feminist principles at the expense of feminine propriety enables Opie to explore the costs of living a life outside of social conventions, at the same time as analysing the way in which society mobilises itself against such destabilising forces. Adeline's death not only questions her own impractical theories but also critiques the prejudices which excluded her from social interactions, including Mellor's unlikely feminotopia. Opie's engagement with Wollstonecraft's radical social critique in a post-revolutionary perspective, whilst satirising elements of Wollstonecraft's life story, also allows her to explore the difficulties society places in the way of progressive change. The resulting satire is pointedly double-edged: it exposes radical, 'Jacobin' social theories as incapable of offering practical reform, at the same time as attacking the existing social structures which stood in the way of the reform which radical theory had revealed was necessary.

'Here is the age of reason exemplified': *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*

Adeline Mowbray shares its narrative structure with Elizabeth Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, which, as Gary Kelly argues, 'switches from one principal story to another or stops for one of the insets, creating for the reader the impression of a loose, complex, but interconnected structure of stories'.²³ Indeed, both novels reflect upon Wollstonecraft's earlier novel, which they seek to reformulate for the reactionary political atmosphere of the early nineteenth century, presenting a more moderate brand of feminism based on their interpretations of Wollstonecraft's feminist thought. The two later novels are further connected by their author's suspicion of putting 'sublime' theories into everyday practice and their anxieties about reading and misreading texts, characters and social situations. Both novels strive to separate Wollstonecraft's infamous biography from her radical philosophy, in order to offer apologies for aspects of Wollstonecraft's social critique whilst rejecting her scandalous life story. Whereas *Adeline Mowbray* focuses on the collision of Wollstonecraft's life and text in the tragic trajectory of the novel's main character, Hamilton's novel divides its focus by following the fates of three female protagonists, none easily identifiable with Wollstonecraft's life but each inflected with a reading of Wollstonecraft's work.

23 Gary Kelly, *Women, Writing and Revolution, 1790–1827* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), 148–9.

In *Modern Philosophers*, Hamilton combines a critique of Jacobin theory and practice, its implications for a moderate interpretation of feminist arguments, and the dangers involved in any act of interpretation.²⁴ As in Opie's *Adeline Mowbray*, Hamilton's novel focuses on the dangers involved in female reading. The anti-heroine of *Modern Philosophers*, Bridgetina Botherim, misreads both the modern philosophy of Godwin's *Political Justice* as a reliable text with which to critique modern society and Hays's *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* as a reliable guide on how to conduct a love affair. Bridgetina's misreading is played as comic farce for much of the novel. Hamilton's tragic heroine, Julia Delmond, is manipulated into social disgrace and personal disaster by her misreading of both the character of her perfidious lover, Vallaton, and of the modern philosophy satirised in Bridgetina's case. Harriet Orwell, the third heroine of the novel, has been taught how to read 'properly' by her father, although, as Claire Grogan argues, her narrative most closely resembles, ironically, the philosophical romances which have waylaid Bridgetina and Julia. Whilst Harriet's narrative concludes with traditional marriage and Bridgetina's consigns her to domestic spinsterhood, Julia's, like Adeline's in Opie's novel, ends with her death and recantation of female philosophy. This conclusion seems to provide didactic closure to the novel: the death of the attractive female philosopher figure, the reinscription of Bridgetina into domestic discourse, and the apotheosis of Harriet's domestic femininity all seem to dismiss Wollstonecraft's radical philosophy. However, Hamilton's overt conservatism within the novel enables her to explicitly defend Wollstonecraft's political philosophy, in a way which seemed impermissible in Opie's text. She accomplishes this by siphoning off the female philosopher's revolutionary energy into the grotesque body of

- 24 In his chapter on Hamilton, Gary Kelly characterises Julia and Bridgetina as 'female Quixotes' (*Women, Writing, and Revolution* 145) satirised by Hamilton throughout the novel, arguing that, through such satire, the reader is asked to 'become counterpart to author ... detached and superior in relation to the characters in the story' (159). Although Eleanor Ty notes Hamilton's complication of her Anti-Jacobin didacticism by her questioning of parental authority in the figures of Mrs Botherim and the Delmonds, she dismisses Hamilton's caricatured Bridgetina as 'a masculine means of controlling a disruptive female figure' (*Unsex'd Revolutionaries*, 26) and Julia as 'the clichéd seduced victim whose only possible end is death' (27). Katherine Binhammer compares Mary Hays and Elizabeth Hamilton's methods of governing female reading in their fictionalised *Memoirs*, arguing that Hamilton's novel depends for its success on a close reading of Hays's revolutionary feminist text ('The Persistence of Reading: Governing Female Novel-Reading in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* and *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*' *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27.2 (Spring 2003), 1–22). Claire Grogan analyses Hamilton's colonial anxieties, arguing that she conflates the figures of the novel's *Modern Philosophers* with a racist vision of the primitive, sexualised bodies of the Hottentots in 'Identifying Foreign Bodies: New Philosophers and Hottentots in Elizabeth Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*' *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 18.3 (Spring 2006), 305–27, 315. Katie Trumpener and Nigel Leask, among others, focus on Hamilton's other novels, particularly engaging with the colonial allegories in *Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah*, giving little or no attention to *Modern Philosophers*.

Bridgetina Botherim, based on a crude caricature of Mary Hays, creating a space for a moderate rereading of Wollstonecraft's philosophy as having practical use in the post-revolutionary era.

Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers* originates in an argument between Hamilton and Mary Hays focusing on their interpretation of Godwinian theory and practice. Hamilton confronted Hays, at first in person and then in an angry letter, about a review attributed to Hays of Hamilton's first novel *Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* (1796). Hays had at first denied that the review was hers, then later admitted it.²⁵ Hays's review begins condescendingly by stating that 'we have received entertainment from the perusal of this lively and amusing little work',²⁶ praising Hamilton's knowledge of Indian affairs throughout the text. Hays questions Hamilton's colonial apologia for British rule in India, however, arguing that 'these injured people have merely *changed masters*, and one species of oppression for another', particularly disagreeing with Hamilton's 'compliments' to Warren Hastings.²⁷ Hays praises Hamilton's critique of women's education in Britain, but again takes issue with her satire of Jacobin philosophy. Hays argues that 'railing is substituted for reasoning' in these sections of the novel, advocating instead: 'Candid and calm discussion, not abuse, [as] the proper method of making rational converts: if conscious of the justness of our cause, we surely injure it by having recourse to calumny' ('Review', 431). Hays sums up her criticism of Hamilton's satire by suggesting that 'little knowledge and great assumption are manifested' by it. She concludes on a more positive note that the novel in general reveals 'a cultivated understanding and benevolent affections ... calculated to undermine and destroy the barbarous, sensual prejudices, which have hitherto been indulged respecting the female mind' (431).

Hamilton's letter attacks Hays for her '*treachery, or malevolence*'²⁸ in publishing such a critical review. She cites Hays's own confession to her of 'how severely you had felt the slight animadversions that had been made upon your

25 Gina Luria Walker, *Mary Hays (1759–1843): The Growth of a Woman's Mind* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 174.

26 [Mary Hays], 'Review of Letters of a Hindoo Rajah', *Analytical Review; or, History of Literature, Domestic and Foreign*, vol. 2 (London: Johnson, 1796), 429. Subsequent references, in-text.

27 Warren Hastings returned from his extensive engagements in colonial projects in India, including acting as Governor-General of Bengal, to be impeached for gross misconduct in 1787. His trial lasted from 1788 to 1795, when he was finally acquitted. The trial grabbed public attention, and formed part of a wider debate about Britain's imperial ambitions. Hamilton, who had familial links to Hastings and the East India Company, supported Hastings's Orientalist interest in Indian society and culture. Hays criticised Hastings's imperialist project as perpetuating oppression. See Peter James Marshall, *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965).

28 *The Correspondence of Mary Hays (1779–1843)*, *British Novelist*, ed. Marilyn L. Brooks (New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004), 313. Emphasis in original. Subsequent references, in-text.

first performance in one of the reviews' (*Correspondence*, 313–14) as hypocritical given that she has now 'inflict[ed] similar pains upon the mind of that unsuspecting friend' (314). Hamilton criticises Hays for obfuscating the specific passages from the novel which displeased her, accusing her of attacking the novel 'in the dark, and with a muffled dagger' (314), besmirching Hamilton's 'fame and character'. Hamilton defends her book as containing 'no accusation against any sect or party; throwing out *no* aspersions upon any character. No personal reflections. No invidious remarks upon the conduct of any individual' (314, emphases in original). Hamilton's repeated denials in this passage seem disingenuous given the resemblance between the speech of one of the novel's characters, Mr Vapour, to Godwin's writing style in *Political Justice*.

Mr Vapour's philosophy certainly has several echoes of Godwin's:

The age of reason is thought, by Mr. Vapour, to be very near at hand. Nothing, he says, is so easy, as to bring it about immediately. It is only to persuade the people in power to resign its exercise; the rich to part with their property; and with one consent, to abolish all laws, and put an end to all government.²⁹

Hamilton has speeded up Godwin's arguments for gradual reform here, but Vapour recognisably parrots a parodic form of Godwin's philosophical anarchism. Vapour also wants to rid the world of gratitude and filial affection, arguing: 'By destroying the domestic affections, what an addition will be made to human happiness!' Hamilton's satire seems to aim at several of Godwin's arguments in *Political Justice*, particularly his infamous depreciation of the 'domestic affections' which he would later problematically retract in his *Memoirs of Wollstonecraft*, and later works (see Chapter 2). Hamilton's heroine, Miss Ardent, takes issue with the position of women in Vapour's philosophy, asking the philosopher how women will feed and clothe themselves after he exclaims, 'What is necessary, every individual may, without difficulty, do for himself' (*Hindoo Rajah*, 260). Vapour contemptuously replies to her challenge, 'Women! ... we shall not then be troubled with – women. In the age of reason, the world shall contain only a race of men!' (261). Ardent contradicts Vapour with her own opinion that in the age of reason 'the perfection of the female understanding will then be universally acknowledged' (261), an assertion with clear echoes of Wollstonecraft's arguments about the necessity for improving women's education in her *Vindication*. This passage is strikingly similar to Hays's critique of the masculine bias in Godwin's political philosophy in the exchanges between Emma and Mr Francis in her own first novel (see Chapter 1), making the disagreement between Hamilton and Hays more about style than substance. Hamilton finishes her letter to Hays by ridiculing her defence of Godwin in their private

29 Elizabeth Hamilton, *Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* (1796), eds. Pamela Perkins and Shannon Russell (Peterborough: Broadview, 2004), 260. Subsequent references, in-text.

correspondence: 'it is a strange sort of compliment you pay your friend Mr Godwin, in taking it for granted that he has made a monopoly of all the absurdity, and extravagance in the world; and that it is impossible to laugh at any thing ridiculous without pointing to him' (314), concluding by insisting that she wrote *Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* before reading *Political Justice*.

Hamilton's response to Hays's review reveals her own underlying anxieties about authorship, worrying that Hays's criticisms could blight her 'fame and character'. They also obfuscate her actual attacks on Godwinian theory and practice in the novel, which Hays had only touched on in her review. Hays criticised Hamilton's portrait of a 'sceptic ... who confounds all distinction between virtue and vice, and preaches *profligacy* and *suicide* as conducive to *general utility*' ('Review', 430). Hamilton's repeated denial that she has attacked specific individuals or used particular events in her satire also paves the way for her highly particularised caricature of Hays herself in the figure of Bridgetina Botherim in *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, along with her detailed attacks on *Political Justice* and Godwin himself, in the figure of Mr Myope. Hays's critical review of Hamilton's first novel frees Hamilton to savage Godwin and Hays, in particular, in her second.

The gloriously named Bridgetina Botherim is figured as a grotesque gargoyle, spouting incomprehensible Jacobin jargon which, it is strongly suggested, she fails to fully understand herself. She is, however, capable of manipulating Godwin's necessitarian philosophy for her own selfish ends. In order to justify her desire to leave her mother's party for one amongst her philosopher friends, Bridgetina indignantly asks, 'And do you think I am *at liberty* to remain here? ... Have I not told you again and again, that I am under *the necessity* of preferring the motive which is most preferable?'³⁰ Bridgetina deploys the words 'liberty' and 'necessity' from Godwin's political philosophy in order to justify her selfish desires. Not only that, but the garbled tautology, 'preferring the motive which is most preferable', is a confused interpretation of Godwin's arguments about necessity in *Political Justice*.³¹

Hamilton frequently has Bridgetina quote large sections from Godwin's works, both to show the girl's lack of understanding of them, but also to make Godwin's reasoning seem as specious and absurd as Bridgetina's. In order to justify her rebuke to a kindly domestic servant who has embarrassed her by returning her dishevelled wig in front of company, Bridgetina criticises her mother's lack of philosophical rigour:

30 Elizabeth Hamilton, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800), ed. Claire Grogan (Peterborough: Broadview, 2000), 46. Emphases in original. Subsequent references, in-text.

31 See William Godwin, *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness* (1793) in *The Political and Philosophical Works of William Godwin*, vol. 3, ed. Mark Philp (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1993), 168–74, for his account of the doctrine of necessity and its consequences for free will, which critics argued rendered men essentially passive.

It is a strange thing, mother, ... that you never will learn to generalize your ideas. The boy may take very good care of your cow ... *but if he derives this benefit, not from a clear and distinct perception of what it is in which it consists, but from the unexamined lessons of education, from the physical effect of sympathy, or from any species of zeal unallied to and incommensurate with knowledge, can this desire be admitted for virtuous?* If your prejudices were not invulnerable, you would not hesitate to acknowledge that it ought not; and if his actions cannot be admitted for virtuous, how can he be called good?

(*Modern Philosophers*, 97, emphasis in original, indicating a quotation from *Political Justice*)³²

Bridgetina's harangue renders Mrs Botherim silent. By coupling together Bridgetina's mean-spirited attack on the servant with Godwin's intellectualised definitions of goodness and virtue, Hamilton reveals the girl's spitefulness and the philosopher's elite snobbery: Godwin's high valuation of knowledge in defining virtue excludes uneducated servants, and other socially marginalised groups from being able to have such qualities. Hamilton also has Bridgetina attack soldiers, the clergy and lawyers using Godwin's criticisms of these professions, usually as virtuous exemplars of these men are present and able to rebut her.

Bridgetina's encounter with two lawyers, during her pursuit of Henry Sydney to London in a stagecoach, reveals her dependence on the simple repetition of Godwin's arguments. At first, her travelling companions 'were not a little astonished to hear such a stream of eloquence flow from so unexpected a source':

They for some time thought it inexhaustible, but on putting some pertinent queries to the fair orator, they discovered that her eloquence, like the little coach and horses to be seen in a shew-box at the fair, ran always in the same round. In vain did they endeavour to make it trace a wider circle; it could neither stop, nor turn, nor go strait forwards, nor move in any other direction than that in which it had first attracted their curiosity.

(237)

Although Bridgetina is able to dominate her domestic circle with her false shows of erudition, her encounters with genuine learning reveal her lack of understanding.

Bridgetina's unrequited love for Sydney allows Hamilton to quote from, and mock mercilessly, Hays's revolutionary novel *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* – at least partially in revenge for Hays's poor review discussed above. Hamilton, along with Bridgetina herself, models the girl's pursuit of Sydney on Emma's desire for Augustus Harvey, as Hamilton makes clear in a footnote explaining a quotation from *Emma Courtney*, 'to which Miss Botherim seems indebted for

32 See William Godwin, *Political Justice*, 143, for the passage Bridgetina repeats here for her own ends.

some of her finest thoughts'. Bridgetina's relation to Julia of the manner in which she fell in love with Sydney closely echoes Emma's first encounter with Augustus: Bridgetina reads a letter from Sydney to his sister; Emma views Augustus's picture at his mother's house. This slight change underscores the literary nature of Bridgetina's desire. Bridgetina's justifications for her continuing passion for Sydney borrow their pseudo-philosophical underpinnings from Emma's 'methodising principles'.

So widespread are Bridgetina's, and Hamilton's, borrowings from Hays's novel that Katherine Binhammer argues: 'The female reader of Hamilton's novel is warned against reading *Emma Courtney* as Bridgetina does, but they are also both explicitly directed to the novel and given excerpts from it so that, for all intents and purposes, they read *Emma Courtney*' ('The Persistence of Reading', 16). Binhammer reveals one of the ironies of socially conservative novels of the period here, as extensive quotation of revolutionary philosophical arguments serves to broadcast principles which reactionary authors would prefer to repress. However, the key phrase in Binhammer's argument is that Hamilton warns against reading Hays's novel 'as Bridgetina does'. Hamilton includes detailed quotations from radical material in order to teach her audience how to read appropriately. Hamilton's inclusion of large sections of Godwin's philosophical work and Hays's novel reveals their 'self-evident absurdities' when placed into the context of the novel's conservative satire.

The ridicule Hamilton pours on the Haysian Bridgetina Botherim allows her to rescue Wollstonecraftian feminism from the reactionary opprobrium directed towards Wollstonecraft's life and work after her death. In an early discussion about Rousseau, Bridgetina chastises him for being 'a stranger to the rights of woman' (*Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, 101). Hamilton's rational hero Henry Sydney agrees:

The inconsistency and folly of his system ... was, perhaps, never better exposed than in the very ingenious publication which takes the *Rights of Woman* for its title. Pity that the very sensible authoress has sometimes permitted her zeal to hurry her into expressions which have raised a prejudice against the whole. To superficial readers it appears to be her intention to unsex women entirely. But –

(101)

At which point, Bridgetina interjects: 'And why should there be any distinction of sex?' underscoring her threateningly unfeminine philosophy. Hamilton ventriloquises male approval for Wollstonecraft here, declining to have any of her female characters defend Wollstonecraft's principles in preference to Henry's balanced account of her *Vindication*. Nevertheless, through Henry, Hamilton manages to defend Wollstonecraft's arguments, characterising the *Vindication* as the best response to Rousseau's sexism. Bridgetina's interruption of Henry also leaves Wollstonecraft's attack on gender distinctions tantalisingly open to interpretation. Hamilton's defence of Wollstonecraft's radical philosophy here is

enabled, although it is also cut short, by her conservative attack on Hays's distinct form of feminism elsewhere. Hamilton's curtailed defence of Wollstonecraft supports her critique of Rousseau's sexualised education for girls in the *Vindication*, connecting Hamilton's arguments for improved female education to Wollstonecraft's. At the same time, Hamilton distances both her own work and Wollstonecraft's from revolutionary feminism, by depicting Wollstonecraft's attack on gendered distinctions as part of her rushed enthusiasm and diverting her own critique of female philosophy onto Bridgetina Botherim, based on Hays not Wollstonecraft.

Bridgetina continues by attacking female propriety: 'Ah! wretched woman, restrained by the cruel fetters of decorum! Vile and ignoble bondage ... a tyranny whose remorseless cruelty assigns to woman the care of her family! But the time will come when the mind of woman will be too enlightened to submit to the slavish talk [sic]!' (102). To which, Harriet Orwell – as dutiful daughter, the actual love interest of Henry Sydney, and Hamilton's alternative model of female behaviour – replies:

Indeed, Miss Botherim ... I do not think that there is any thing slavish or disagreeable in the task: nor do I think a woman's energies, as you call them, can possibly be better employed. Surely the performance of the duties that are annexed to our situation, can never be deemed mean or ignoble? For my share, so far from feeling any derogation of dignity in domestic employment; I always feel exalted from the consciousness of being useful.

(102)

Harriet quietly refutes Bridgetina's clamorous declarations, stressing her own sense of duty, dignity and practicality. Claire Grogan notes that Harriet's arguments chime with Hannah More's domestic feminism ('Identifying Foreign Bodies', 311). Her calm rationality makes Bridgetina's impetuous arguments against domesticity seem lazy rather than ideological. Bridgetina is not allowed to reply to Harriet's arguments; Harriet is instead praised by her father for her properly religious sentiments.

Hamilton's defence of Wollstonecraft comes as something of a surprise in a novel so concerned with satirising examples of revolutionary philosophy, quoting extensively from Godwin's *Political Justice* and Hays's *Emma Courtney* in order to render their more avant garde theories absurd. Hamilton does not quote from any of Wollstonecraft's texts. Although this means that she also does not defend Wollstonecraft's arguments in much detail, it is still significant that Hamilton decides to defend them at all, in a novel which otherwise attacks radical writing in detail, and at a time when Wollstonecraft had become the focus of such counter-revolutionary scrutiny. Instead, Henry Sydney's brief defence of Wollstonecraft's critique of Rousseau shows Hamilton appropriating elements of Wollstonecraft's arguments, particularly on female education and women's duties and responsibilities, in order to develop her own, more moderate feminism. In

her later novel *Cottagers of Glenburnie*, Hamilton again accesses Wollstonecraft's earlier educational work to express her own pedagogical principles.

Furthermore, Hamilton's mockery of Bridgetina's Godwinian mentor, Mr Myope, has a precursor, rather unexpectedly, in Wollstonecraft's *Maria*. Whilst recounting her narrative of prostitution and recovery in this earlier novel, Jemima complains that, after the death of her philosophical lover has left her destitute once again, his friends proved decidedly unhelpful. Requesting advice from 'an advocate for unequivocal sincerity ... [who] had often, in my presence, descanted on the evils which arise in society from the despotism of rank and riches' (*Maria*, 87), she receives in reply 'a long essay on the energy of the human mind, with continual allusions to his own force of character', concluding 'That the woman who could write such a letter as I had sent him, could never be in want of resources, were she to look into herself, and exert her powers' (88). Wollstonecraft seems to me to be mocking distinctly Godwinian ideals in this episode: sincerity, the evils of rank and riches, the energy of the human mind, force of character and exertions of 'powers'. The 'continual allusions' to himself seems a particularly pointed dig at Godwin's self-absorption, picked up by Hays, Opie and Hamilton and developed in their own confrontations with Godwin's masculinist political philosophy.

Hamilton's own mockery of Bridgetina and her Godwinian mentors frees her to give her third protagonist, Harriet Orwell, a distinctly philosophical tone. Binhammer describes Harriet as selfless compared to the different selfishnesses of Bridgetina and Julia, positioning her as 'most like a conventional heroine' ('The Persistence of Reading', 16) – in other words a fictional creation in a traditional marriage plot. Although Harriet's progress through the novel towards her marriage with Henry is basically unimpeded by dramatic incident, Binhammer's assessment obscures her more philosophical function in the novel. As in her reply to Bridgetina quoted above, Harriet becomes Hamilton's mouthpiece for a more sympathetic, domesticated philosophy for women, based on a religious sense of duty and a pragmatic approach to women's situation in society, aligned to the older, eighteenth-century representation of the female philosopher described in my introduction. With Harriet, Hamilton depicts her own romanticised role for women: practical, deferential and religious; able to debate complex moral and political points whilst remaining humbly aware of her own intellectual weakness. In an unfortunately interrupted conversation between Harriet and Julia, while Julia is recovering from an injury sustained after one of her misinformed misadventures, Harriet easily convinces Julia of the intellectual vapidness of Bridgetina's plagiarised philosophy:

Do you not think ... it would be better for poor Miss Botherim to have a memory rather less retentive than to give you out, as she does, speech after speech from the author she has last read, without alteration or amendment ... [S]o many are found capable of retaining the *exact words* of a well-sounding author, while to the few is confined the more estimable power of impressing the *sense* and *substance* in the mind.

(*Modern Philosophers* 166–7, emphasis in original)

Able to impress on Julia's mind both sense and substance, Harriet is well on the way to convincing her of the foolishness of the rest of her philosophical system when she is called away to attend to her aunt on her deathbed, leaving Julia in the care of the rather less dependable Bridgetina, which paves the way towards her fateful decision to abscond with Vallaton.

Bridgetina, firmly persuaded Henry Sydney is in love with her, also decides to pursue him to London, in order to persuade him to join her scheme to emigrate to live amongst the Hottentots with her faux-philosophical friends. This ridiculous scheme originates from Mr Glib's reading of François Le Vaillant's *Voyage dans l'intérieur de l'Afrique* (1790), a French travelogue available in various English translations which valorised the 'noble savagery' of African society, drawing connections between African sexual, social and cultural practices and Revolutionary ideals. To Bridgetina, Mr Myope and the Goddess of Reason, Glib exclaims:

See here! ... all our wishes fulfilled! All our theory realised! Here is a whole nation of philosophers, all as wise as ourselves! All enjoying the proper dignity of man! Things just as they ought! No man working for another! All alike! All equal! No laws! No government! No coercion! Every one exerting his energies as he pleases! Take a wife today; leave her again to-morrow! It is the very essence of virtue, and the quintessence of enjoyment!

(141)

Glib's reading of Le Vaillant's analysis of Hottentot society stresses his own utopian beliefs in anti-authoritarian equality and libertarian sexual practices. Hamilton uses his excitement to underscore both Glib's laziness – he stresses the Hottentots lack of useful employment – and his appetite for sexual promiscuity. Glib's excited description of the 'Gonoquais horde' as 'a whole nation of philosophers, all as wise as ourselves!' works in a particularly double-edged way in Hamilton's text: Glib is excited because his utopian desires seem to have a real outlet amongst the Hottentots; Hamilton is suggesting that the modernity of Glib's philosophy has as its precedent what she sees as the primitive and uncivilised sexuality of African society.

By quoting from Le Vaillant's descriptions of Hottentot marriage, work, and religion, or lack thereof, Hamilton has her modern philosophers make explicit the links between Hottentot primitivism and Godwin's political philosophy. Bridgetina declares: 'It is evident ... that the author of our illustrious system is entirely indebted to the Hottentots for his sublime idea of the Age of Reason. Here is the Age of Reason exemplified; here is proof sufficient of the perfectibility of man!' (142). Hamilton confirms this exclamation with a footnote directing her reader to compare particular sections of *Political Justice* with her quotations from Le Vaillant. By doing so, she explicitly links Godwin's perceived Jacobinism with colonial preconceptions of African society and sexuality.

Julia's death convinces Bridgetina to give up her scheme to emigrate, with her band of Jacobin philosophers, to live amongst the Hottentots, instead returning

to a life of domesticity with her mother. Julia dies from the after-effects of the poison she took in despair in order to terminate both her pregnancy and her own life. She also dies from a broken heart – a heart fragmented by her lover Vallaton's desertion, leaving her destitute, pregnant and prostituted to a villainous acquaintance; by her own betrayal of her father's hopes, hastening his early death; and by her belated realisation of the vacuity of her philosophical ideals.

Julia's final words to Bridgetina fully endorse the status quo, in a way in which Adeline's equivocations in Opie's novel never do: 'Those prejudices [of society]' become 'a salutary fence', the girls' transgression of which threatens the moral fabric of society (382–3). She concludes by telling Bridgetina to 'Go home to your mother, my Biddy; and in the sober duties of life forget the idle vagaries which our distempered brains dignified with the name of philosophy' (383). The total dismissal of 'philosophy' here marks Hamilton's novel as much closer to the Anti-Jacobin tradition than Opie's more equivocal text, in spite of Hamilton's more sympathetic account of Wollstonecraft earlier in the novel. Indeed, Hamilton's more explicit sympathy with Wollstonecraft is only possible in the context of her much more conservative defence of social and moral norms, contrasting sharply with Opie's questioning, subversive narrative. Hamilton is sympathetic to Wollstonecraft's plan for improved female education, which *Modern Philosophers* modulates into moderate reform, at least in the private sphere, through its depiction of the domestic heroine, Harriet Orville. She remains suspicious of Wollstonecraft's radicalism, depicting it as rushed enthusiasm and exploring the dangerous consequences of such in the trajectories of Bridgetina and Julia. In her novel, she co-opts aspects of Wollstonecraft's *Vindication* into a more conservative narrative of gradual social improvement.

Bridgetina returns to her mother, a movement which reinscribes Hamilton's anti-heroine into the domestic sphere that her actions have threatened. Claire Grogan argues that 'Bridgetina is reclaimed because the greater fear is not perhaps that the New Philosophers will emigrate to the interior of Africa, but that they will bring the Hottentots to English shores', concluding that:

Bridgetina's story [acts] as a timely warning to the female reader of how to avoid being the wrong kind of spectacle by arguing that there is no real power to be garnered by being either a female New Philosopher or English Hottentot if it reduces you to a pitiful and easily abused sexual creature. Thus the female philosopher, like the female Hottentot, comes to an early and tragic end, abused by a patriarchal society that can only see her as a sexual creature.

(‘Identifying Foreign Bodies’, 327)

Grogan makes clear that Hamilton uses racial anxieties surrounding the perceived primitive sexuality of the Hottentots to comment on the much more threatening phenomenon of a rampant female sexuality at home, combined

with Jacobin-inspired libertarian philosophy. She also focuses on Hamilton's use of the conservative interpretation of the female philosopher, viewing the figure as imbricated in dangerous, self-destructive sexuality. This focus on the reactionary iteration of the figure allows her to develop the more pragmatic, domestic figure of Harriet, who is nevertheless tinged with romance by fulfilling the terms of the traditional marriage plot, critiqued elsewhere in Hamilton's novel.

In an obituary of Elizabeth Hamilton in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (December, 1816), which is attributed to Maria Edgeworth, *Modern Philosophers* is sympathetically reviewed as exposing 'those whose theory and practice differ; to point out the difficulty of applying high flown principles to the ordinary but necessary concerns of human life; and to show the danger of bringing every man to become his own moralist and logician'.³³ In this obituary, Edgeworth notes the critique of revolutionary theory and practice linking the novels of Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth herself under discussion in this chapter. Edgeworth describes how the character of Bridgetina Botherim 'became a standing jest, a proverbial point in conversation', reducing 'to measure and reason those who, in the novelty and zeal of system, had overleaped the bounds of common sense' ('Character and Writings', 623). Like Hamilton in her letter to Hays, Edgeworth obfuscates the personal attack in Hamilton's caricatured female philosopher by stating that *Modern Philosophers* 'avoids all satire of individuals' (623), even though Bridgetina was clearly linked in the novel's reception with a satire on Mary Hays and her revolutionary novel.³⁴ However, the measured tone of the obituary distinguishes itself, and Hamilton's character and writings, from Anti-Jacobin attacks on sexual immorality and its paranoiac defence of the existing social order, by stressing Hamilton's common sense rationality. Indeed, Edgeworth's obituary praises Hamilton's 'philosophic, moral and religious' strengths as a writer, singling out her educational works as the foundations of her 'literary reputation'.

Hamilton deflects criticism of Wollstonecraft's feminist philosophy by overtly attacking Hays and the sexual politics of *Emma Courtney* in the caricatured female philosopher figure, Bridgetina; in doing so, she is able to explicitly defend some of Wollstonecraft's arguments in her own novel: separating what she sees as Wollstonecraft's valid political and philosophical aims, particularly for improved female education, which Hamilton also argues for in her later work, from the spurious goals of her *Modern Philosophers*. In *The Cottagers of Glenburnie*, Hamilton adapts Wollstonecraft's pedagogical protagonist Mrs Mason, from *Original Stories from Real Life*, as the practical, pragmatic,

33 [Maria Edgeworth], 'Character and Writings of Mrs Elizabeth Hamilton', *The Gentleman's Magazine* Supplement 86.2 (December, 1816), 623–4, 623. Subsequent references, in-text.

34 For example, the *Anti-Jacobin* identifies Bridgetina's conversation as 'an excellent imitation of that vicious and detestable stuff which has issued from the pen of M—y H—s. Indeed the whole character of Bridgetina so strongly resembles that of this impassioned Godwinian, that it is impossible to be mistaken' (*Anti-Jacobin* 7 (1801), 370).

phlegmatic heroine of her didactic novel: Hamilton's Mrs Mason brings order and cleanliness to a dirty, if well-meaning Scottish village, concluding the novel as a teacher at the local school, inculcating critical thinking into the young girls under her charge, explicitly against the intellectual torpor of mechanical domestic work.³⁵ Edgeworth's obituary concludes with a celebration of Hamilton's 'example ... of that uniform propriety of conduct, and of all those domestic virtues; which ought to characterise the sex, which form the charm and happiness of domestic life' (334). In her own novel, *Belinda*, Edgeworth would test just such a 'uniform propriety of conduct' against competing standards of female behaviour.

'Apropos, have you read *St. Leon*?': *Belinda*

Belinda does not end with the death of a female philosopher. In Edgeworth's original sketch of the novel, entitled 'Abroad and at Home', Lady Delacour was scheduled to die from cancerous complications relating to her breast, injured in an Amazonian duel, which would have presented 'female philosophy' as damaging to female nature.³⁶ Many of Lady Delacour's planned Jacobin tendencies are placed in the finished novel onto the character of Harriet Freke. Freke is a pseudo-Wollstonecraftian caricature used by Edgeworth to explore anxieties surrounding female philosophy; also, like Hamilton's Bridgetina Botherim, she is based more on Mary Hays than Wollstonecraft. Freke fiercely debates the rights of woman with men and women, cross-dresses and flirts with Lady Delacour. These indecorous activities – Freke views all delicacy as false – combine intellectual exertion considered foreign to women with threateningly masculine behaviour, such as encouraging Lady Delacour to fight the duel which climaxes in her seemingly fatal, self-inflicted wound to the breast. Even so, Edgeworth removes this threatening female figure from the narrative by having Freke mutilated, with rather

35 See Elizabeth Hamilton, *The Cottagers of Glenburnie and Other Educational Writing* (1808), ed. Pam Perkins (Glasgow: The Association of Scottish Literary Studies, 2010), particularly 'Chapter XVIII: Hints Concerning the Duties of a Schoolmaster', 200–11.

36 'Original Sketch of *Belinda*: Abroad and at Home' was published in Frances Edgeworth, *A Memoir of Maria Edgeworth, with A Selection from Her Letters*, vol. 3 (London: Joseph Masters and Son, 1867), 269–76. The sketch is dated 10 May 1800. Frances Edgeworth prefaces the sketch with the following information: 'Several of the sketches which Maria made for her stories have been preserved, and as they show the pains she took with her design, and are curious from the alterations which occurred in the writing out of the story, I subjoin a specimen of them. They were written in small, narrow books, shaped like a cheque-book, and, indeed, often sewed into the empty cover of a cheque or stamped receipt-book', 269. In the original sketch, not only does Lady Delacour have some of the personality traits later grafted onto the new character of Harriet Freke in the published novel, but Clarence Hervey has character flaws which are shifted onto Mr Vincent. Lord Delacour is also much more of a brute in the sketch than in the finished text.

malicious irony, in a man-trap, rather than resorting to the hackneyed tropes of seduction and death.³⁷

Edgeworth's resistance to the clichéd seduction plot culminating in the death of the fallen woman, which reached its classic apogee in Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa* in the mid-eighteenth century, leads her to write a distinctly metatextual novel, seemingly self-aware of the given destiny of its characters. Susan Egenolf also reads *Belinda*'s metatextuality as indicative of Edgeworth's personal involvement in politically charged polemic, arguing that the artistic glosses in the novel reveal political manoeuvres by which women can maintain control over their lives.³⁸ I argue that Opie and Hamilton's interest in challenging the confusions inherent in revolutionary theory and practice is modulated in Edgeworth's novel into a critique of the theory and practice of novel writing itself. The focus on reading in both *Adeline Mowbray* and *Modern Philosophers* is sharpened in *Belinda* in order to challenge readers' expectations not only of reading in general but of reading this novel in particular. Lady Delacour takes on a more and more explicit role in guiding the novel to her desired conclusion, climaxing in her deliberate orchestration of the novel's finale to mimic a conventional happy ending. The difficulties of interpretation, of reading texts, other people, the self and the world, which defines each of these novels, is turned inwards in *Belinda* to challenge readers' approaches to Edgeworth's own writing. Edgeworth contrasts the interpretative habits of Harriet Freke, Lady Delacour and Virginia St Pierre, with Belinda's reading of books, individuals and the world of the novel, revealing the inconsistencies and blindnesses of each woman's approach. Given this range of interpretative strategies within the novel, Edgeworth demands that her readers reconsider and recalibrate their own critical strategies.

In the chapter entitled 'Rights of Woman', Belinda is suddenly confronted by Harriet Freke. Freke tells Belinda that she has come to rescue her from the

37 Critical attention on Edgeworth's oeuvre has effectively rescued her from Elizabeth Kowaleski-Wallace's accusations of 'patriarchal complicity' in *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and Patriarchal Complicity* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), by focusing on Edgeworth's assured control of the complex ambiguities running throughout her Irish and society novels. Interest in Edgeworth's writing has accelerated in the twenty-first century with a series of studies analysing her work. Cliona Ó Gallchoir's magisterial *Maria Edgeworth: Women, Enlightenment and Nation* (Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2005) contextualises *Belinda* by reading it alongside Edgeworth's pedagogical tracts and short stories and comparing it to Sydney Owenson, Lady Morgan's *The Wild Irish Girl*. Belinda receives attention in several essays in Julie Nash, *New Essays on Maria Edgeworth* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), including Joanne Cordon, 'Why Maria Edgeworth Did Not Write *Castle Belinda*' (131–60), which argues that Edgeworth divided her analyses of class, race and gender between her Irish and society novels in order to give greater focus to her critique, and Nash's own study on the role of servants in the novel, developed in her monograph *Servants and Paternalism in the Works of Maria Edgeworth and Elizabeth Gaskell* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007).

38 Susan Egenolf, *The Art of Political Fiction in Hamilton, Edgeworth and Owenson* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009), 73–104.

Percivals, describing Belinda as a ‘distressed damsel’.³⁹ Belinda refuses what she calls Freke’s ‘knight-errantry’ (*Belinda*, 176), underscoring both Freke’s gender-bending antics and Edgeworth’s metafictional technique, having characters use and disavow romance clichés. Their conversation turns to reading, in one of the novel’s many metatextual fillips. Freke attempts to seduce Belinda away from the domestic happiness of the Percival family, first by complimenting her beauty, then, when this fails, her spirited nature:

‘For my part ... I own I should like a strong devil better than a weak angel.’

‘You forget,’ said Belinda, ‘that it is not Milton, but Satan, who says, “Fallen spirit, to be weak is to be miserable”.’

‘You read I see! I did not know you were a reading girl. So did I once! but I never read now. Books only spoil the originality of genius. Very well for those who can’t think for themselves – but when one has made up one’s opinions, there is no use in reading.’

(177)

Freke’s admiring reference to Satan aligns her with English Jacobins like Wollstonecraft, who notes her preference for Milton’s Satan over Eve, deconstructed as a male fantasy figure, in her second *Vindication*.⁴⁰ Freke’s dislike of reading, however, already suggests her lack of philosophical understanding, especially as a character in a novel which both explicitly refers to a wide range of literature (including poetry, plays, travelogues, letters, memoirs, religious, moral and philosophical tracts, and other novels) and explicitly draws attention to itself as a work of fiction. Freke argues that ‘Conversation is worth all the books in the world’ but is unable to respond to Belinda’s reply, ‘And is there never any nonsense in conversation?’ (177).

In her argument with Mr Percival on the rights of woman, Freke reveals her dependence, like Bridgetina Botherim in Hamilton’s novel, on repeated slogans above genuine understanding. Freke and Percival argue over Freke’s generalisations that ‘all politeness [is] hypocrisy’ and ‘shame is always the cause of women’s vices’. Percival calls the first claim contradictory and asks whether Freke means false shame, to which she replies, ‘All shame is false shame’. Belinda blushes, and this response enters the argument: Mr Vincent argues that Belinda’s blushes ‘speak *for* her’; Freke retorts, ‘*Against* her ... Women blush because they understand’. Percival then asks, ‘And you would have them understand without blushing? ... So would I: for nothing can be more different

39 Maria Edgeworth, *Belinda* (1801), ed. Siobhán Kilfeather. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 2 (London: Pickering and Chatto, 2003), 175. Subsequent references, in-text.

40 Wollstonecraft contrasts Adam and Eve to Satan in a footnote, stating that ‘instead of envying the lovely pair, I have, with conscious dignity, or Satanic pride, turned to hell for sublimer objects’ (*A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol 5, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 94).

than innocence and ignorance. Female delicacy—' (179, emphases in original). At which point, Freke interrupts:

'This is just the way you men spoil women ... by talking to them of the *delicacy of their sex*, and such stuff. The delicacy enslaves the pretty delicate dears.'

'No, it enslaves us,' said Mr Vincent.

'I hate slavery! *Vive la liberté!*' cried Mrs Freke, 'I'm a champion for the Rights of Woman.'

(179, emphases in original)

Freke repeats Wollstonecraft's arguments against the imposition of a male ideal of propriety on women, and, like Wollstonecraft, links this to colonial prejudice, particularly slavery. However, her conversation reveals her lack of any real feminist principles to replace either propriety or prejudice. She fails to pick up on Vincent's Rousseauvian retort that female delicacy 'enslaves' men more than it does women – the kind of gallant male hypocrisy so carefully deconstructed by Wollstonecraft in her *Vindication* – and is unable to respond to Percival's argument that delicacy 'conduces to their [women's] happiness', except by repeating that she is 'an enemy to delicacy'.

It is Belinda who brings this more and more nonsensical conversation to a climax by pointing out that Freke has failed to 'prove the hypocrisy' in female delicacy (180). This leads to Freke specifying indelicately that a woman is a hypocrite when she does not 'go and tell' a man 'honestly' that she likes him (180). This embarrasses Belinda into silence and ends the conversation at an impasse with Freke characterising female delicacy as cunning and Percival characterising it as prudence. Unable to reply, Freke exclaims: 'You may say what you will, but the present system of society is radically wrong: whatever is, is wrong' (180). Her suggestion to improve society is 'by tearing away what has been called the decent drapery of life' (180), at which point Edgeworth has her anti-heroine 'getting up and stretching herself so violently that some part of her habiliments gave way' (180), forcing her to withdraw from male company in order to set her own drapery to rights.

Freke's desire to tear away 'the decent drapery of life' is an allusion to Edmund Burke's *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) in which he complains that

All the decent drapery of life is to be rudely torn off. All the super-added ideas, furnished from the wardrobe of a moral imagination, which the heart owns, and the understanding ratifies, as necessary to cover the defects of her naked shivering nature, and to raise it to dignity in our own estimation, are to be exploded as ridiculous, absurd, and antiquated fashion.⁴¹

41 Edmund Burke, *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790) (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 77.

Burke's defence of traditions in his appeal for 'decent drapery' is replayed as farce in Edgeworth's novel, revealing the revolutionary Freke to be ridiculous and absurd. By tearing away Freke's drapery, Edgeworth playfully connects her satirical representation of the radical iteration of the female philosopher with Burke's wider critique of revolutionary fervour. Her playfulness here contrasts with Burke's serious intentions in the passage she alludes to, distinguishing her more moderate political position from the politician's. Edgeworth reveals Freke's lack of systematic thinking in her exclamatory, and increasingly repetitive, conversation and her own hypocrisy in retreating from male company in order to restore her costume.⁴²

After Freke has left, having failed to persuade Belinda to leave with her, Mr Vincent compares her to Creole women, first by alluding to her role as obeah-woman in frightening his servant, and then by contrasting Freke's outspoken demeanour with the 'softness, grace, delicacy' of 'our creole ladies' (181), to which list Mr Percival adds 'indolence' (182). The Percivals, Vincent and Belinda then have a conversation on whether 'ignorance, as well as indolence, [is] an amiable defect essential to the female character' (182), challenging Vincent's self-proclaimed 'prejudices' (182) on whether the principle of a rational, well-educated woman would square with the demands of female propriety. The conversation ends with everyone pleased with Vincent's humility, protesting that he wished to have more knowledge and that Belinda had taught him to become aware of his prejudices.⁴³

42 Colin and Jo Atkinson argue that Freke resembles Mary Hays, aligning her with Hamilton's satire of Hays in Bridgetina Botherim, in 'Maria Edgeworth, *Belinda*, and Women's Rights' *Eire-Ireland* 19 (1984) 94–118, 110–11. Their argument does not really distinguish between Wollstonecraft and Hays's positions, however, leading to a rather simplistic analysis of revolutionary feminism in the novel.

43 A growing number of studies explore the links between Edgeworth's critique of the hypocritical standards of female propriety and colonial anxieties about race, miscegenation and imperial rule explored in *Belinda*. Susan Greenfield, "'Abroad and at Home': Sexual Ambiguity, Miscegenation and Colonial Boundaries in Edgeworth's *Belinda*", *PMLA* 112.2 (March 1997), 214–28, Andrew McCann, 'Conjugal Love and the Enlightenment Subject: The Colonial Context of Non-Identity in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*', *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 30.1 (Autumn 1996), 56–77, and Kathryn Kirkpatrick, "'Gentlemen Have Horrors Upon the Subject': West Indian Suitors in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*", *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 5.4 (July 1993), 331–48, each add to the debate about the significance of Edgeworth's colonial concerns to her feminist argument in *Belinda*. Harvey argues that Edgeworth parallels the position of women in English society with the position of slaves and Creoles under imperial rule in the West Indies. Greenfield's analysis pulls in another direction, arguing that Lady Delacour, reinscribed at the novel's conclusion as a 'proper lady', acts as guarantor of colonial advantage and gender difference (219). McCann complicates this reading by focusing on the differences between 1801 and 1810 editions of the novel, arguing that the earlier edition questioned both colonial advantage and gender difference, especially in the marriage of Mr Vincent's black slave Juba to a working-class white woman. Kirkpatrick analyses the reasons behind this change, focusing on the equivocation of Edgeworth's explanation for the revision: 'My father says that gentlemen have horrors upon this subject, and would draw

Whereas Deborah Weiss debates Belinda and Harriet's position as 'true' and 'false' female philosopher in 'The Extraordinary Ordinary Belinda', I focus on Lady Delacour's role as Godwinian mentor, like Glenmurray in *Adeline Mowbray* or Mr Myope in *Modern Philosophers*, marked by her scattered references to Godwin's texts and her status as unreliable role model for Belinda.⁴⁴ Weiss argues that Freke takes on all of the negative associations of the counter-revolutionary iteration of the female philosopher figure which allows Edgeworth to portray Belinda sympathetically as an Enlightenment-style female philosopher, shorn of the figure's threatening revolutionary overtones. I agree with Weiss's argument, which further works for the way in which Hamilton depicts Bridgetina in opposition to Harriet, discussed above, and also for the way in which Austen depicts Mary Crawford against Fanny Price in *Mansfield Park*, discussed in my next chapter. My focus on Lady Delacour shows how Edgeworth reintroduces subversive elements of revolutionary philosophy into the novel, which she elsewhere sanitises with her characterisation of Belinda as a 'safe' female philosopher.⁴⁵

Lady Delacour refers to Godwin's writing explicitly at two points in the novel, both moments of crisis in her relationship with Belinda. The first appears at the end of the chapter entitled 'Jealousy', concluding in Belinda's decision to leave the Delacour household and take up her invitation to stay with the Percivals. Belinda decides to leave her friend after Lady Delacour accuses her of seducing Lord Delacour in an attempt to become his second wife after Lady Delacour's death. In order to conceal her real pain at Belinda's departure, Lady Delacour appears '[f]resh rouged, and elegantly dressed ... performing her part to a brilliant audience in the drawing room, when Belinda entered' in order to leave the house. Lady Delacour, 'turning carelessly towards her', asks Belinda:

'Miss Portman ... where do you buy your rouge? Lady Singleton, would you rather at this moment be mistress of the philosopher's stone, or have a patent for rouge that will come and go like Miss Portman's? A propos, have you read *St. Leon*?' her ladyship was running on to a fresh train of ideas, when a footman announced the arrival of lady Anne Percival's carriage; and miss Portman rose to depart.

(165)

conclusions very unfavourable to a female writer who appeared to recommend such unions: as I do not understand the subject I trust to his better judgement'. Kirkpatrick argues that Edgeworth has shown a very precise understanding of the conflation of sexual and racial anxieties in her novel. Therefore, her lack of understanding focuses on the personal horrors of the gentlemen rather than any horror towards the subject of interracial marriage.

44 See Deborah Weiss, 'The Extraordinary Ordinary Belinda: Maria Edgeworth's Female Philosopher', *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 19.4 (Summer 2007), 441–61.

45 See my 'Amazonian Fashions: Lady Delacour's (Re)Dress in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*', in *Picturing Women's Health*, eds. F.M. Scott et al. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 2014), 29–44, for a more detailed account of Lady Delacour's critique of female nature, and the physical, mental and emotional costs of this on her health.

Seeing that Belinda is really going to leave, Lady Delacour's performance breaks down and she begs her to stay; Belinda is only capable of repeating 'Adieu!' before hurrying out of the house 'with the strongest feeling of compassion for this unhappy woman, but with an unaltered sense of the propriety and necessity of her own firmness' (165). Lady Delacour's speech plays upon Belinda's real blushes, deliberately mistaking them for a make-up which gives the appearance of eternal youth, before noticing that Belinda's blushes 'come and go'. Lady Delacour's reference to *St. Leon* signifies at once her movement onto a different set of ideas and suggests to the reader a set of connections between her character and Godwin's flawed narrator: personal nobility corrupted by social mores – St Leon is nearly destroyed by gambling, Lady Delacour by fashion; and their egotism fractures the family unit.

Lady Delacour's use of *St. Leon* further complicates Edgeworth's exploration of female nature versus artifice. By teasingly misreading Belinda's real blushes as make-up, Lady Delacour ironically connects Belinda's youthful inexperience with not only St Leon's more cynical pursuit of the philosopher's stone but her own jaded concern to disguise the aging process. Her comments to Lady Singleton hint at women's worries about aging, and also suggest Lady Delacour's, and Edgeworth's, critique of societal double standards: society demands that women conform to an image of youthful naturalness which becomes more and more untenable with age, finally depending on the artifice it seems to scorn. Edgeworth's intertextual allusion to Godwin's 1799 novel forges connections between the two writers in a post-revolutionary context, using Godwin's critique of the way in which social pressures fracture individual relationships within families to explore a more feminine quandary. Both *St. Leon* and *Belinda* partake in liberal political and aesthetic strategies seeking to reformulate revolutionary philosophy in a post-revolutionary context. Both texts aim to reform reading habits, social norms and, in Edgeworth's novel especially, gendered preconceptions to a progressive agenda against conservative demands for unquestioning loyalist obedience in the context of the Napoleonic wars.

Belinda flees Lady Delacour's house to stay with the Percivals, who represent an ideal picture of a perfect couple. In the chapter, 'Domestic Happiness', Lady Percival forms a deliberate contrast to Lady Delacour's fashionable, frenetic energy. She is described as 'without pedantry or ostentation', having 'much accurate knowledge, and a taste for literature, which made her the chosen companion of her husband's understanding, as well as of his heart' (Chapter 16, 216). In many ways, Lady Percival reflects the eighteenth-century ideals of the female philosopher – knowledgeable, literate, an equal companion to her husband, without those bugbears of female philosophy 'pedantry or ostentation'. Like the similarly ideal Belinda, however, she lacks a distinctive character in the novel – all the interest and energy being focused on Harriet and, more successfully, on Lady Delacour. Edgeworth tackles the ideal nature of the Percivals by arguing that '[t]hose who unfortunately have never enjoyed domestic happiness, such as we have just described, will perhaps suppose the picture to be visionary and romantic', concluding that the happiness Belinda feels in her company is 'perfectly natural' (216–17).

Elsewhere, Edgeworth uses Lady Delacour to question both perfection and naturalness – the novel as a whole is much less assured about the vision of domesticity Edgeworth presents here.

In the chapter called ‘Reconciliation’, Edgeworth reunites Lady Delacour with both Belinda and her estranged husband, and Lady Delacour struggles to reconcile Belinda with Clarence Hervey, particularly his mysterious relationship with Virginia St Pierre. Lady Delacour shows Belinda the letters she has received from Clarence during his equally mysterious journey through Dorset and Devonshire. Focusing on his description of a happy marriage, designed to encourage Lady Delacour’s rapprochement with her Lord, she comments that:

I take it all in good part, because, to do Clarence justice, he describes the joys of domestic Paradise in such elegant language, that he does not make me sick. In short, my dear Belinda, to finish my panegyric, as it has been said of some other epistles, if ever there were letters calculated to make you fall in love with the writer of them, these are they.

(211)

These last lines deliberately echo Godwin’s assessment of Wollstonecraft’s *Letters from Sweden*: ‘If ever there was a book calculated to make a man in love with its author, this appears to me to be the book’.⁴⁶ Edgeworth plays with gender categories here, allowing Lady Delacour to perform Godwin’s role of seduced critic and placing Hervey in Wollstonecraft’s position as seductive letter writer. Edgeworth’s playful, literary allusions to Godwin here differentiate her from both Hamilton’s critique of Godwinian political philosophy as dangerous and damaging to established social structures in *Modern Philosophers* and Opie’s satire of Godwin’s anti-marital arguments in *Adeline Mowbray*. Aligning Lady Delacour with Godwin reveals her radical inheritance, underscoring her threat to social structures of stability and making Edgeworth’s decision to redeem her at the end of the novel intriguing. On the other hand, Lady Delacour seems distinctly anti-Godwinian. Godwin argued for sincerity, candour and a strict adherence to truth throughout his writing career, whereas Lady Delacour seems to value artifice above nature: throughout the novel, Lady Delacour argues for the importance of keeping up appearances and maintaining a fashionable façade. In the end, what Edgeworth offers in Lady Delacour is her reimagining of the Godwinian hero, unreliable, complex and conflicted, as heroine – re-energising the revolutionary nostalgia in Godwin’s portrait of Marguerite de Damville in the more active, compelling and finally elusive Lady Delacour.

Although Edgeworth reveals the social costs of this artificiality – Lady Delacour’s happy exterior belies a profoundly miserable woman – the novel remains as suspicious as Lady Delacour is of naturalness. Clarence Hervey’s desire to educate his ward, Virginia St Pierre, as a natural woman is revealed to be wishful thinking – a male sexual fantasy – which leads to a distinct decline in her mental

46 Godwin, *Memoirs*, 122.

and physical health. Hervey draws his educational theories from Rousseau, tellingly described by Edgeworth as an 'eloquent' writer, highlighting Rousseau's fashionable caché by the end of the eighteenth century. Throughout the chapter revealing Virginia's mysterious background, Edgeworth stresses how much Hervey is influenced not only by fashionable educational theory but by wider fashion in literature at the time; for example, he changes his ward's name from Rachel to Virginia after the exemplary fictional heroine of Henri Bernardin de St Pierre's *Paul et Virginie* (1787), which, as Edgeworth makes clear, reveals the fictive nature of Hervey's enterprise.

Hervey refuses to educate Virginia about the fashionable world, keeping her in splendid isolation, and, significantly, ignorance. In this isolation, Virginia reads romances which encourage her febrile imagination to invent her own sexual fantasy surrounding a mysterious figure from her past, then feel guilty for not being attracted to the neglectful Hervey. Although Hervey manages to keep Virginia secluded from fashionable society, his growing boredom with her leads her to, ironically, find solace in just the sort of fashionable reading matter which Hervey has both censored her from accessing and accessed himself to fashion her. In trying to create a 'natural' woman, Hervey only succeeds in fashioning a doubly fashionable woman: formed firstly from Hervey's Rousseauvian pedagogy and secondly by her own taste for popular romance. Virginia's fictive development leads her to the brink of ill health. Tormented by nightmares which testify to her guilt about the lack of attraction she feels towards Hervey – one of which ends with him berating her as 'Perfidious, *ungrateful* Virginia! you are the cause of my death!' (*Belinda*, 388) – Virginia sinks into depression, characterised by dejection, tearfulness and aversion to Hervey.

Both Hervey and Virginia, although neither of them are attracted to the other, feel duty bound to marry each other through misunderstanding: Hervey because he feels responsible for Virginia's passive state of childish ignorance and Virginia because she feels it to be Hervey's expectation of her. Lady Delacour is instrumental in separating the two mismatched non-lovers, declaring to Belinda, the real object of Hervey's affections, 'This Virginia! O, how I hate her! I am sure Clarence cannot love her' When Belinda upbraids her for hating a woman she has never met, Lady Delacour responds, 'Oh, I know what she must be, ... a soft, sighing, dying damsel, who puts bullfinches in her bosom' (*Belinda*, 453). Edgeworth adds to Lady Delacour's knowing caricature of Virginia's clichéd status as an ideal woman by having her 'anxious to carry away with her but a little bullfinch' (*Belinda*, 369) on Hervey's first adoption of her. Lady Delacour self-consciously orchestrates Virginia's reunion with both her father, whose bout of madness also taints with suspicion the healthiness of his daughter, and Captain Sunderland, the original behind her romantic fantasies, which leads to Hervey's declaration of love for Belinda. Lady Delacour takes on an explicitly metatextual role in the novel's final scenes, asking the other characters, the reader of the novel, and perhaps Edgeworth herself: 'shall I finish the novel for you?' (*Belinda*, 364), and concluding by manipulating the various characters into a deliberately staged tableau:

‘Yes’, said her ladyship; ‘it is so difficult, as the critic says, to get lovers off upon their knees. Now I think of it, let me place you all in proper attitudes for stage effect. What signifies being happy, unless we appear so? Captain Sunderland – kneeling with Virginia, if you please, sir, at her father’s feet. You in the act of giving your blessing, Mr Hartley. Mrs Ormond clasps her hands with joy – nothing can be better than that, madam – I give you infinite credit for the attitude. Clarence, you have a right to Belinda’s hand, and may kiss it too. Nay, miss Portman, it is the rule of the stage. Now, where’s my lord Delacour? He should be embracing me, to show that we are reconciled. Ha! here he comes. Enter lord Delacour, with little Helena in his hand. Very well! a good start of surprise, my lord. Stand still, pray, you cannot be better than you are. Helena, my love, do not let go your father’s hand. There! quite pretty and natural! Now, lady Delacour, to show that she is reformed, comes forward to address the audience with a moral – a moral! – yes,

Our *tale* contains a *moral*, and, no doubt,
 You all have wit enough to find it out.
 (365–6, emphases in original)

As Egenolf points out, although Lady Delacour gestures towards her new, willing subordination to her husband, she actually commands him to stay with his daughter, remaining centre stage herself. By doing so, she ‘avoids the controlling domestic structure of the scene and unsettles the familial stability of this tableau vivant’ (*The Art of Political Fiction*, 102). Contrary to Greenfield’s reading of Lady Delacour as inhabiting the role of ‘proper lady’ in this conclusion, she escapes from the domestic plot of Edgeworth’s finale, leaving the text’s anxieties open to the reader’s own interpretation. Belinda and Harriet, as contrasting representations of the female philosopher figure, are sidelined in this final scene in favour of Lady Delacour, offering Edgeworth’s alternative reading of the thinking woman: dominant, contradictory and performative.

Claudia Johnson concludes her analysis of Frances Burney’s 1814 novel *The Wanderer* by stating that Burney ‘attempts to rewrite *The Wrongs of Woman* by vindicating those wrongs, by upholding traditional notions of gender even as her own novel protests them, and by deferring our happiness to another time; but it finally succeeds only at witnessing the unnegotiable DIFFICULTY of gender itself’.⁴⁷ Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth’s novels, which Johnson sees as precursors of Burney’s belated entry into the troubled genre of Wollstonecraft reception studies, each struggle to rewrite not only the revolutionary feminism of Wollstonecraft’s last novel but also the reactionary response to Wollstonecraft herself. The unfinished nature of *Maria* opens the novel to various interpretations: radical critique of socio-sexual hypocrisy, psychological exploration of the

47 Claudia Johnson, *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender and Sentimentality in the 1790s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 188.

networks of feeling between communities of women, or dangerously erotic apologia for adultery. The interpretative freedom of Wollstonecraft's text results in a hermeneutics of suspicion in Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth's novels. All of which strive to show the difficulties inherent in any act of interpretation, whilst at the same time being fissured with contradictory impulses themselves. These novelists both condemn and sympathise with Wollstonecraft's troubled life and struggle with the legacy of her radical philosophy. They are split between upholding traditional socio-sexual hierarchies and challenging their claims to virtue, propriety and decorum.

In these early nineteenth-century post-revolutionary novels, the female philosopher figure from the 1790s, with her sexually and socially destabilising revolutionary background, is neutralised by either being killed off, disfigured, forced back into domesticity, or represented in a deliberately domestic manner. These sanitising strategies allow for the subtle reintroduction of Wollstonecraft's political and philosophical arguments in each of these novels, driving forwards their informed social critiques of the hypocrisies at the heart of the marriage market and of fashionable society itself. In Edgeworth's *Belinda*, the rehabilitation of Lady Delacour also offers a way out of the dilemma of representing the female philosopher, by granting agency to a woman who remains tantalisingly outside traditional categorisations of domesticity: she gestures towards her new roles of devoted wife and doting mother while commanding husband and daughter to remain in their places, staying centre stage herself.

3 England in Eighteen Hundred and Fourteen

The state of the nation in Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* and Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park*

‘Our tempestuous day’

Published nearly twenty years after Mary Wollstonecraft's death, Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* and Frances Burney's *The Wanderer* (both 1814) engage with the textual legacy of Wollstonecraft's revolutionary life and work in the 1790s and with the post-revolutionary context of the 1810s in which they were written. Austen and Burney both utilise and disavow Wollstonecraft's radical analysis of the cultural forces which shape individual character in society in order to create a space in their texts for societal critique. They focus on the psychological costs of social inclusion, whilst stressing the need for national stability in the closing stages of war with Napoleonic France. Burney's novel explicitly distances her own writing from Wollstonecraft's by including a partially caricatured pseudo-Wollstonecraftian anti-heroine, Elinor Joddrel, who serves a similar function to characters in earlier texts, such as Bridgetina Botherim in Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers* and Harriet Freke in Edgeworth's *Belinda*. *The Wanderer's* engagement with earlier stereotypes contributes to its contemporary – and modern – critical reception as an anachronism. Austen implicitly distances herself from Wollstonecraft's political philosophy by not only refraining from reference to Wollstonecraft's life and work in any of her novels but also taking a deliberately ambiguous stance towards both politics and philosophy throughout her writing career. Nevertheless, both novels reveal the way in which Wollstonecraft's radical analysis of the impact of deficient education on women's character and opportunities permeated early nineteenth-century women's writing, as Austen and Burney draw on her ideas and develop them for the post-revolutionary context of England in 1814.

The year 1814 is of literary and historical significance to my thesis, firstly, as it represents the previously acknowledged limit of the influence of the female philosopher on women's writing¹; secondly, as several works by women writers are published in the year, sharing a set of similar concerns; and thirdly, as the

1 See Claudia Johnson, *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 21.

historical settings of Burney and Austen's novels allow them space to comment on contemporary political, social and cultural issues. Alongside Austen and Burney's novels, 1814 saw the publication of Mary Brunton's *Discipline* and Maria Edgeworth's *Patronage*, each novel sharing with the others a concern for women's role in society, anxieties about the limits of female performance, and an engagement with the political, social and cultural context within which these texts were written. The publication of Walter Scott's *Waverley* also obviously makes 1814 a richly literary year, connecting historical concerns with the contemporary situation of Scotland in the novel's subtitle *'Tis Sixty Years Since*. Like Scott, Austen and Burney use the historical settings of their novels, explicit in Burney and deliberately vague in Austen, to comment on contemporary concerns. My next chapter, focusing on Mary Shelley, will explore her engagement with Scott's historical novels in more detail.

In 1814, England was still a year away from winning the war with Napoleonic France; this long war, spanning from the late 1790s until Napoleon's final defeat at Waterloo, had far-reaching consequences on life in Britain. The government tightened regulations on freedom of expression, with party-led propaganda machines, such as *The Anti-Jacobin Review*, linking obedience to patriotism.² Growing concerns about the war's high military and economic costs were treated as unpatriotic dissidence. Social unrest, amongst working-class and radical factions, protesting against high taxes, low living standards, and an electoral system which excluded them, was policed increasingly violently.³ The conflict's high military and monetary costs for Britain prompted Barbauld's apocalyptic vision of the ruins of a bankrupt country, haunted by its war-dead, in her satirical poem *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* (1812). The poem opens with a vision of continental Europe falling under the yoke of tyranny:

Colossal Power with overwhelming force
Bears down each fort of Freedom in its course;
Prostrate she lies beneath the Despot's sway,
While the hushed nations curse him – and obey.⁴

Barbauld's confrontation between tyranny and liberty, envisaged on a continental scale, echoes in Burney's attempt to connect an individual woman's

2 See Kevin Gilmartin, *Writing Against Revolution: Literary Conservatism, 1790–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007) for an analysis of the reactionary print culture of the early nineteenth century, and its strategies to bolster a patriotic sense of nationhood against revolutionary concerns.

3 For the impact of the Napoleonic wars on English society, see, for example, E.P. Thompson, *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963) (London: Penguin, 1991) for a seminal analysis of the development of radical and artisan movements after the French Revolution.

4 Anna Laetitia Barbauld, *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* in *The Works of Anna Laetitia Barbauld, with a Memoir by Lucy Aiken*, ed. Lucy Aiken. vol. 1 (London: Longman, Hurst, Rees, Orme, Brown, and Green, 1825), 232, lines 7–10.

desire to live independently with the terrifying exigencies of the French Revolution and in Austen's smaller scale focus on an individual woman's hushed obedience to a power experienced as colossal. Barbauld's poem was harshly reviewed for its lack of patriotism, amounting to disloyalty in time of war. John Wilson Croker, in his review of the poem for the *Quarterly*, explicitly attacked Barbauld as a woman writer straying into the 'male' genre of historical poetry.⁵ Women writing about the historical moment were seen as overstepping a political boundary, breaching the faultline between literary and political public spheres analysed by Habermas.

Both Burney and Austen engage with their historical moment, however; with Burney exploring the consequences of the French Revolution on the private life of her heroine and Austen setting the action of her novel, albeit ambiguously, around the abolition of the slave trade.⁶ The abolition movement, although hailed as a moral success, had economic implications for English estates dependent on the free flow of slave labour, explored in Austen's treatment of the moral and economic failings of the Bertram family.⁷ The financial aftershocks of war also threatened social stability, with the late 1800s and early 1810s seeing the rise of radical protest amongst the working classes. Working class radicalism triggered military violence, culminating in the Peterloo massacre of 1819. This event is protested against in Percy Bysshe Shelley's sonnet 'England in 1819', sharply criticising the royal dissolution, political stagnation and police violence

5 See James Chandler, *England in 1819* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998) for a detailed analysis of the reception of Barbauld's poem, 114–15.

6 R.W. Chapman, in his 1923 edition of the works of Jane Austen, dates the action of the middle section of *Mansfield Park* from Fanny Price's coming-out ball on 22 December, with the calendar of 1808–9. Brian Southam has argued that the later dates of 1812–13 are more likely, based on a reference to 'Crabbe's Tales', referring to George Crabbe's *Tales in Verse*, published 1812. See John Wiltshire, 'Introduction' to *Mansfield Park*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), xliii–xlv, for a discussion of these issues. Wiltshire sides with Chapman's views, but concludes 'It is certainly after the abolition of the slave trade, but I do not believe that Jane Austen meant the reader to recognise that the action took place in a precise year or years', xlv.

7 Criticism analysing Austen's position in relation to abolition forms a subset in the vast body of research on the social, political, economic and cultural repercussions of the slave trade and the abolition movement. For Austen's position on this issue, discussed in more detail below, see, for example, Edward Said, Katie Trumpener, and the collection, *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*, eds. You-Me Park and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan (Abingdon: Routledge, 2004). For the wider implications of slavery and abolition, see, for example, Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (London: André Deutsch, 1944) and more modern responses, such as Seymour Drescher, *Capitalism and Antislavery* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1987). For feminist criticism analysing the intersection of abolitionist and feminist concerns in the eighteenth century, see, for example, Deirdre Coleman, 'Conspicuous Consumption: White Abolitionism and English Women's Protest Writing in the 1790s' *ELH* 61.2 (1984), 341–62 and Felicity Nussbaum, *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995).

of ‘our tempestuous day’.⁸ Although Austen and Burney are both more conservative than either the explicitly radical Shelley or the challenging, Dissenting Barbauld, their novels share elements of the poets’ trenchant social criticism, revealing the striking continuities between writers of different political persuasions in their negotiation of the post-revolutionary landscape of early nineteenth-century politics, social reform and generic limitations.

Peter Knox-Shaw’s connection between Austen’s earlier novel *Sense and Sensibility* (1811) and William Godwin’s 1799 novel *St. Leon* as Post-Jacobin texts (see Chapter 21) draws out the two authors’ shared concerns over the development of the individual in relation to society and for social stability in the post-revolutionary era. Knox-Shaw argues that Austen is influenced more by the sceptical tradition of the Scottish Enlightenment than the Anti-Jacobin writing with which Marilyn Butler influentially aligns her. He uses the term Post-Jacobin to align Austen’s seemingly conservative concerns with Godwin’s, read as dangerously radical at the time, in order to ‘point to the moderate, even liberal character of Jane Austen’s stance among her contemporaries’.⁹ In my view, post-revolutionary writing, from formerly radical writers such as Godwin and Hays to explicitly conservative ones such as Hamilton, through more liberal thinkers like Edgeworth, share a slippery perspective on the desire for reform balanced by the need for stability, exemplified in Austen and Burney’s works, under discussion in this chapter. I suggest that the lack of critical consensus over the political allegiances expressed in Burney’s *The Wanderer* and Austen’s *Mansfield Park*, in which both novels have been positioned as sympathetically radical or satirically conservative, can, to some extent, be resolved by contextualising them as post-revolutionary, containing an uneasy mixture of radical sympathy and conservative satire, held in suspension within a liberal solution.¹⁰ Both Austen and Burney, like Godwin, Hays and the authors studied in my last chapter, struggle to utilise revolutionary arguments critiquing existing social structures in order to articulate the need for gradual reform in a post-revolutionary political environment which remained highly suspicious of ‘Jacobin’ philosophical ideals.

8 Percy Bysshe Shelley, ‘England in 1819’ in *The Poems of Shelley*, vol. 3: 1819–20, eds. Jack Donovan et al. (Harlow: Longman, 2011), 192, line 14.

9 Peter Knox-Shaw, *Jane Austen and the Enlightenment* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 130.

10 Contemporary reviews of *The Wanderer* expressed uneasiness about its political engagement with the French Revolution, with the *Critical Review*, for example, situating the novel as an anachronism: ‘the sympathy excited by this order of incident is gone by’ (*Critical Review*, 4th series, 5 (April 1814), 408). The modern reception of *Mansfield Park*, in particular, struggles over the novel’s political orientation, as discussed further below. See Vivien Jones, ‘Post-feminist Austen’ *Critical Quarterly* 52.4, (December 2010), 65–82, for her opening comparison of *The Wanderer* with *Mansfield Park* and her thought-provoking categorisation of Austen as post-feminist, which shares elements of my Post-Jacobin analysis of the novel, but concludes that Austen is essentially a conservative satirist, whereas I argue that her satire is considerably more double-edged and less conservative, particularly when contrasted with the concerns of her much more obviously conservative contemporary, Hannah More.

'FEMALE DIFFICULTIES': *The Wanderer*

Burney's critical account of the French Revolution, her inclusion of a satirically pseudo-feminist anti-heroine, and her explicit interest in class throughout *The Wanderer* seem to align the novel with Grenby's account of the aims of Anti-Jacobin fiction: firstly, to 'display the Revolution in France in all its horror'; secondly, 'to caricature the "new philosophy" of the British radicals, to show their utopian schemes as, first, chimerical and second, productive only of evil'; and, finally, to 'appeal directly to the fears of their overwhelmingly middle- and upper-class readers, possessive of their property and jealous of their social standing, by exposing Jacobinism as a ruthless assault on hierarchy, status and wealth'.¹¹ Rather than reading the novel as explicitly Anti-Jacobin, Claudia Johnson attacks the novel as a muddle-headed conservative apologia for social inequality, displaying 'a wish to protest the effects of social injustice while making sure that the social structures, customs, and attitudes that produced them remain intact'.¹² I argue that Burney's desire to preserve the 'social structures, customs, and attitudes' alongside her critique of social injustice can be construed more generously as the tension produced by conflicting desires – for stability and reform. This tension is a product of the novel's post-revolutionary context: although the novel is set in the French Revolution, that era of unprecedented movement within seemingly solid social structures, it was published at a time which greatly felt the need for increased, even rigid, social stability. Burney's conservative desire to preserve social structures certainly differentiates her politics from Shelley's radicalism, intent on overturning existing culture, but, I argue, does not mark her out as a straightforwardly Anti-Jacobin writer. Burney's focus on gradual reform allows for a more liberal position than Anti-Jacobin ideology allows. Indeed, *The Wanderer* analyses not only the costs of political upheaval in the form of the French Revolution but the related costs of greater social cohesion – the paranoid demand for unquestioning patriotism – within island Britain in response to continent-wide disturbance.

Burney grounds her evaluation of the social consequences of Britain's troubled response to the French Revolution on the level of an individual woman's experience of suspicion, gossip and ignorance, particularly within the realm of paid labour. Opposing Johnson's frustrated criticism of *The Wanderer*, Margaret Anne Doody defends Burney's novel, arguing that its 'detailed presentation of the life of the working woman was at the end of the century associated with liberal or radical women writers such as Inchbald, Hays, and Wollstonecraft. In undertaking the subject, Burney was ... entering the domain of the radical women and in effect allying herself with them'.¹³ Doody emphasises what

11 Matthew Grenby, *The Anti-Jacobin Novel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 11–12.

12 Claudia Johnson, *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender and Sentimentality in the 1790s* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995), 170. Subsequent references, in-text.

13 Margaret Anne Doody, *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 351. Subsequent references in-text.

Johnson neglects: Burney's radical representation of women's work, tracing her heroine's descent from the relatively bourgeois occupation of lady's companion, through the ambivalent social position of (unwilling) actress, poorly paid music teacher, singer, and into the lower-class jobs of milliner and mantua maker, concluding with her itinerant status amongst rural labourers. Far from a conservative celebration of existing social structures, Burney explores the deadening effects of women's work, not simply as offensive to the actually aristocratic Juliet Granville's sensibilities but on the various female workforces Ellis meets on her way down the social strata, in what Doody claims is a prophetic analysis of workers' 'alienation' (356).¹⁴ Doody's attempt to claim Burney as a radical writer is somewhat undermined in *The Wanderer* by the imposition of Ellis's happy ending on the narrative: recognised by her aristocratic family, married to her somewhat ambivalent lover, and returned to her position as lady of leisure. Ellis's banishment of the female furies who have hounded her steps through post-revolutionary Britain provides a satisfying conclusion to her personal trials but not to the wider social ills trenchantly diagnosed by Burney throughout the rest of the novel. Burney struggles to connect Ellis's immediate experience of oppression with the paranoid malaise characterising the response to revolution across the British public sphere. Johnson complains that the novel's 'ambition is to bring the heroine's tribulation into conjunction with the upheaval of the French Revolution and its aftermath in England. Its failure is that it cannot finally determine a consistent basis on which to do so' (*Equivocal Beings*, 166). The drive to incorporate the tumultuous events of the Revolution into a coherent narrative, based on an individual's experience of historical change, characterises the post-revolutionary literature I discuss. That Burney, ultimately, does not succeed in determining a consistent basis on which to balance these issues does not lessen her aims to do so. In my reading of *The Wanderer*, I focus on Burney's problematic bridging of the personal and the political, arguing that her political allegiances are less clear cut than either Johnson, who would pin her down as essentially conservative, or Doody, who wants to make her radical, allow.

Johnson's problem with *The Wanderer*, which is really Burney's problem, and Doody's as well, is the gap between the huge political events alluded to in the novel and Ellis's smaller personal problems, which Burney wants to use to comment on these wider political concerns. Burney is unable to 'determine a consistent basis' on which to bridge the gap between the generic plot of the eighteenth-century novel of courtship and marriage on one side and the aftermath of the French Revolution on the other. This is not just Burney's problem,

14 Burney's heroine, nameless at the beginning of the narrative, called Ellis after some confusion about her enquiry concerning a missing letter addressed to L.S., and finally revealed to be Juliet Granville several hundred pages into the novel, presents a deliberate difficulty as to how to name her. To avoid the awkwardness of 'Ellis/Juliet', and to stress the artificial quality Burney suggests is already inherent in women's names, I will use 'Ellis' throughout this chapter, unless quoting material which refers to her differently, or discussing her contested aristocratic origins as 'Juliet Granville'.

but an aesthetic question facing novelists at the beginning of the nineteenth century, particularly women writers, including Austen, to whom the courtship plot is the permissible expression of female desire within the public sphere. In other words, Burney, along with other women writers of the early nineteenth century, is struggling to enunciate the crucial feminist argument that the personal is political, at a time when the personal and political were increasingly divided into separate private and public spheres.¹⁵ Burney's awareness that the personal is political clashes with Britain's post-revolutionary desire to separate the personal from the political, marking the personal as safely domestic and feminine. This gap between the private sphere and the public sphere of political action, and women writers' aesthetic strategies for dealing with it, creates the uncertain space in women's writing of the early nineteenth century, in which accusations of subversive radicalism in contemporary reviews and satirical conservatism in modern criticism can be levelled at the same writers about the same novel.

The fissure between private and public in *The Wanderer* is both alluded to and rejected in Burney's prefatory dedication to her father. Burney plays down the difficulty she had in travelling with the manuscript of her novel from France to England, instead celebrating 'the honour and liberality of both nations' for allowing her papers' safe passage 'upon my given word that the papers contained neither letters, nor political writings; but simply a work of invention and observation'.¹⁶ Burney explicitly rejects the idea that her manuscript would constitute 'political writings' at the same time as making the implicitly political point, at a time when England was engaged in a bloody war with France, that both nations are honourable and liberal. Her disingenuous appeal to readers 'who expect to find here materials for political controversy; or fresh food for national animosity; must turn elsewhere their disappointed eyes' seems to reject the political element of her novel. However, her description of *The Wanderer* as 'a composition upon general life, manners and characters; without any species of personality, either in the form of foreign influence, or of national partiality' (*The Wanderer*, 5) implicitly reintroduces political argument to the novel: a work which rejects 'national partiality' along with 'foreign influence' is already making a political point, laying the groundwork for Burney's critique of Britain's paralysed social hierarchy.

15 See, for example, Michael McKeon, *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private and the Division of Knowledge* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007) for a detailed reading of the shifting significance of public and private spheres throughout the long eighteenth century. In his analysis of Austen's *Pride and Prejudice*, McKeon argues that 'the vexed relationship between family and the state ... has been decisively internalized and privatized within the realm of the family' (692), a rhetorical strategy Austen further explores and problematises in *Mansfield Park*. Arguably, the distinction between Burney and Austen is that Burney foregrounds these issues in the external world of work, with a heroine forced outside of the family environment.

16 Frances Burney, *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties* (1814) (Oxford: Oxford World's Classics, 1991), 5. Subsequent references in-text.

The Wanderer begins in revolutionary France, ‘During the dire reign of the terrific Robespierre’ (11), on board a ship of English passengers escaping to England. Reluctantly rescuing a nameless, disguised, seemingly black (and injured) woman with a French accent, they embark – rudely discussing the identity of their uninvited guest. Burney focuses on questions of identity at the opening of her novel, by withholding the names of the English passengers, all of whom will become central characters in the unknown woman’s life in England, until they are revealed in dialogue. This innovative technique stresses the lack of fixed identity of the woman Elinor Joddrel calls the Incognita: Ellis remains incognito, even to the reader, for the majority of the novel. Later, Ellis herself, in a rare moment of complaint, although silent and private, pinpoints the difficulties inherent in women’s lack of fixed identity. She exclaims:

how insufficient ... is a FEMALE to herself! How utterly dependant upon situation – connexions – circumstance! how nameless, how for ever fresh-springing are her DIFFICULTIES, when she would owe her existence to her own exertions! Her conduct is criticised, not scrutinized; her character is censured, not examined; her labours are unhonoured, and her qualifications are but lures to ill will! Calumny hovers over her head, and slander follows her footsteps!

(*The Wanderer*, 275)

Burney seeks to generalise Ellis’s particular lack of identity here into one of the FEMALE DIFFICULTIES of the novel’s subtitle: any female, not just Ellis, is insufficient to herself because she depends for her identity on her social context: her ‘situation – connexions – circumstance!’ Her difficulties are not only ‘nameless’ but circle around her namelessness. In Ellis’s complaint, Burney also suggests the moral direction of her novel: as readers, unlike the characters in the novel, we are expected to scrutinise Ellis’s conduct, examine her character and honour her labours, independent of her actual status as the aristocratic Juliet Granville. Burney uses *The Wanderer*’s subtitle, ‘Female Difficulties’, as a leitmotif throughout her novel, returning to it in key passages of the text. I will structure my analysis around these moments.

Burney’s withholding of her heroine’s name forces her reader to consider Ellis’s individual actions within society, implying support for Ellis and criticism of that society’s hypocrisy. Katharine Rogers notes that ‘calling these difficulties “female” suggests some inherent weakness in woman; but both content and context show that they are caused by social attitudes and conditions’.¹⁷ Ellis clearly separates ideas of women’s weakness from these FEMALE DIFFICULTIES, helpfully emphasised by Burney here. Ellis’s ‘situation – connexions – circumstance’, or lack thereof, each collude to obstruct her own exertions. She makes clear that her conduct, character, labour and qualifications would allow

17 Katherine Rogers, *Frances Burney: The World of ‘Female Difficulties’* (New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990), 136.

her to exert herself for her own good, but each trait is liable to social abuse. This is the closest Ellis gets to complaining in the novel, and even on her own feels she must check herself: ‘candour, the reigning feature of her mind, repressed her murmurs. Involved as I am in darkness and obscurity, she cried, ought I to expect a milder judgement? No! I have no right to complain. Appearances are against me; and to appearances are we not all either victims or dupes?’ (*The Wanderer*, 275). Whereas Ellis struggles to repress her complaint, Burney allows her readers to see the justness of her heroine’s reasoning. Even if Ellis is involved in darkness and obscurity, her arguments that her conduct should be scrutinised not criticised, and so forth, still hold true. Ellis’s analysis of the importance of appearance, therefore, is undercut by her earlier complaint: society’s focus on appearance is figured as one of the female difficulties with which she has to contend.

Burney confronts the feminist implications of the contradictions inherent in the gendered expectations of female behaviour directly in her exploration of Wollstonecraft’s life and work throughout *The Wanderer*. Jennifer Golightly, Tara Ghoshal Wallace and Jodi Wyett each argue that Burney divides her treatment of Wollstonecraft into a focus on her notorious life, through Elinor’s radical arguments and misbehaviour, and a more sympathetic use of her textual arguments, through Ellis’s experiences descending through the English class structure, encountering bias and prejudice at every turn.¹⁸ This develops Doody’s contention that Elinor resembles Hays’s Emma Courtney more than Wollstonecraft (*Frances Burney*, 337–8), allowing a freer movement of Burney’s appropriation of Wollstonecraft’s ideas over the whole text of the novel. In any case, Elinor voices Wollstonecraftian arguments in the text when Ellis remains stoically, perhaps stubbornly, silent; further, many of Elinor’s points are left unanswered, her fervour for revolutionary ideals allowed a remit for criticism of English inequalities. Burney criticises Elinor’s behaviour and lack of religious feeling, but many of her political arguments are allowed to stand unchallenged. Indeed, Elinor’s arguments, separated from her self-destructive desire for Albert Harleigh, are often indirectly proved by Ellis’s experiences.

Burney satirises the way in which Elinor co-opts revolutionary feminism as a rationalisation for her desire, aligning the novel with Hamilton’s critique of Hays’s *Emma Courtney*. However, Burney moves beyond Hamilton’s satire, firstly, by making Elinor a more complex and sympathetic character than Bridgetina Botherim, and, secondly, by privileging several of Elinor’s political points through Ellis’s experiences. For, example, in her revolutionary rationalisation of her illicit desire, she accuses Harleigh that he has ‘long since, in common with every man that breathes, wished exploded, the Rights of woman’, which she goes on to

18 Unpublished papers given at the ASECS 2010 panel, ‘The Contrary Marys: The Fictionalizing of Wollstonecraft’: Jennifer Golightly: ‘Where in *The Wanderer* is Wollstonecraft? Radicalism, Feminism, and Jacobinism in 1814’; Tara Ghoshal Wallace: ‘Self and Text: Wollstonecraft in Burney’s *The Wanderer*’; Jodi Wyett: ‘Re-making Mary: Figuring “Female Difficulties” in Frances Burney’s *The Wanderer*’.

defend: 'Rights, however, which all your sex, with all its arbitrary assumption of superiority, can never disprove, for they are the Rights of human nature; to which the two sexes equally and unalienably belong' (*The Wanderer*, 175). Burney's satire here is double-edged: Elinor's coupling of women's rights to her explicitly sexual desire for Harleigh foregrounds her link to Anti-Jacobin caricatures of Wollstonecraft and Hays; the way in which she extends her discussion of women's rights to human rights ties into one of Burney's serious points in the novel, turning the satire which seems to be directed at Elinor onto men like Harleigh, and onto the social system which legitimises men's 'arbitrary assumption of superiority' over women.

Elinor's discussion of women's rights marks her first gesture towards committing suicide. She has demanded an audience with both Albert Harleigh, the object of her affections, and Ellis, whom she rightly suspects is in turn the object of Harleigh's. Her intention is to announce her love for Harleigh and also to discover if her suspicions are correct, carrying a poniard to threaten suicide if her hopes are dashed. Burney's coupling of feminist arguments with the threat of suicide is more melodramatic than satirical here, tracing the personal costs of political engagement: Elinor's radical politics are coupled with her revolutionary desires in a way which makes both self-destructive, but only in terms of the existing separation between private and public spheres in society. Elinor's suicide attempts, which punctuate the narrative of *The Wanderer*, can be read as an allusion to Wollstonecraft's own despairing attempts to take her life. However, Burney stresses the theatrical, performative element in Elinor's gestures towards suicide, distinct from Godwin's serious treatment of Wollstonecraft's decisions in his *Memoirs*. Throughout *The Wanderer*, there is a tension between Burney's sympathy for Elinor's Wollstonecraftian ideals and an anxiety about her character and Wollstonecraft's shared transgressions.

Elinor complains about the social restrictions placed on women which degrade them, rendering them 'sleepy, slavish, uninteresting automatons' (177) rather than companionate wives or useful mothers. In a long harangue, Elinor challenges Harleigh with a series of questions duplicating revolutionary arguments about the position of women in society, asking, firstly, why men alone have 'been supposed to possess, not only force and power for action and defence, but even all the rights of taste', secondly, 'Why ... not alone to be denied deliberating upon the safety of the state of which she [woman] is a member ... must even her heart be circumscribed by boundaries as narrow as her sphere of action in life'; and concluding, with the exclamation: 'And do you, even you, Harleigh, despise unbidden love!' (177). Elinor's shifting focus on taste and desire here at first aligns her with Wollstonecraft's arguments about the debilitating emphasis on women's manners before evolving in a more Haysian direction – her forthright expression of sexual feeling aligning her with Emma Courtney. Elinor makes a series of linked arguments in this passage: first she attacks men's assumption of force in general but especially in relation to the marriage market, then she critiques the political inequality inherent in women's lack of suffrage, coupling these to the implicit policing of women's desire in society, particularly the prohibition on women's language itself:

‘Must every thing that she says, be limited to what has been said before?’ (177). In response to Elinor’s expression of her revolutionary desires, Harleigh responds, “[66] No, Elinor, no! – if I durst tell you what I think of it – ”/[99] He stopt, embarrassed’ (177). Elinor’s arguments are allowed to stand; Harleigh’s stuttering reply acquiesces to her points, shows exactly his lack of daring, and ends on his embarrassing inability to reply to Elinor’s revolutionary language.

Elinor’s political arguments for women’s rights are undermined by her treatment of Ellis in her stage-managed suicide attempt. After declaring her revolutionary passion to Albert Harleigh, as Hays’s Emma Courtney had to her Augustus Harley,¹⁹ Elinor (correctly) suspects Harleigh’s lukewarm response means that he is already in love with Ellis. She manipulates Harleigh into revealing his unspoken desire for Ellis, embarrassing both of her friends into blushes which she reads as recriminatory. Haranguing Harleigh, she abuses Ellis: ‘Oh, Harleigh! Harleigh! ... to what a chimera you have given your heart! to an existence unintelligible, a character unfathomable, a creature of imagination, though visible!’ continuing, ‘Oh, Harleigh! how is it you thus can love all you were wont to scorn? double dealing, false appearances, and lurking disguise! without a family she dare claim, without a story she dare tell, without a name she dare avow!’ (181). Elinor cruelly pinpoints not only the difficulties which beset Harleigh’s relationship with Ellis, but Ellis’s dilemma in relation to her situation in Britain: nameless and without story or family. Her focus on Ellis’s lack of social position, having neither a name nor a family she can avow, shows Elinor’s investment in the social structures her revolutionary ideals ought to reject. Elinor’s emotional blackmail of Harleigh and Ellis, climaxing in her threat to kill herself, which Ellis avoids by promising that she can never marry Harleigh, reveals the selfishness underneath her revolutionary polemic: she is not campaigning for the rights of woman, but only for *her* rights as a woman.

Elinor’s second suicide attempt emphasises the staginess, selfishness and scorn for Ellis of the first. Elinor interrupts Ellis’s benefit concert, meaning to disrupt Ellis’s big moment although it actually saves her from the humiliation of the event, by stabbing herself in the breast. She had disguised herself as a mute gentleman, flinging off this disguise to reveal herself ‘in deep mourning’ (359), calling to Harleigh and cursing Ellis, and refusing medical attention. Burney underscores both Elinor’s desperation and her theatrical performance, in some sense wanting to outdo Ellis, throughout this scene. Nora Nachumi analyses the way in which *The Wanderer* ‘dramatizes the performative nature of female experience, and in doing so, denaturalizes simple equations between the heroine’s essential self and how she appears’.²⁰ She reads Ellis’s performances as showing that her ‘ability to act like a lady in a theatrical sense consequently collapses the difference between on stage and off, suggesting that one is every bit as much of

19 Doody notes the seemingly deliberate similarity in the names of Hays’s and Burney’s ambivalent heroes, *Frances Burney*, 337.

20 Nora Nachumi, *Acting Like a Lady: British Women Novelists and the Eighteenth-Century Theater* (New York: AMS Press, 2008), 137. Subsequent references, in-text.

a stage as the other' (*Acting Like a Lady*, 140). This underplays Burney's, and her heroine's, anxieties surrounding female performance: their awareness of the performativity of female nature sits uncomfortably with their desire for their audiences to see beyond social construction to inner character. Nachumi argues that Burney's focus on appearance urges her readers to realise that Ellis 'is a heroine because of her character rather than by virtue of her family and name', although she also points out that Burney fails to realise this concept fully, due to her 'inability to accurately represent the inner life of [her] heroine' (142). I argue that Burney's focus on appearance is an attempt to bridge the personal and political, by forcing her individual heroine into public space, divided from her family and name. Burney's focus on Ellis's public reception, rather than revealing her 'inner life' asks her readers to receive Ellis in a different way from how the characters in the novel read her character and actions.

When Ellis visits Elinor during her somewhat unwilling convalescence, Elinor denigrates Ellis's pleading the 'severe DIFFICULTIES of a FEMALE, who, without fortune or protection, had her way to make in the world' (397). Elinor derides this: 'Debility and folly! Put aside your prejudices, and forget that you are a dawdling woman, to remember that you are an active human being, and your FEMALE DIFFICULTIES will vanish into the vapour of which they are formed' (397). Elinor's attack on FEMALE DIFFICULTIES ironically anticipates Hazlitt's review of *The Wanderer* in which he describes them as 'created out of nothing' (discussed further below). Burney ironises Elinor's criticisms here, suggesting Elinor's hypocrisy through her own debility and folly as she is recuperating from her suicide attempt. It is Ellis who is active throughout *The Wanderer*, and Elinor who seems to dawdle, and it is Ellis who discovers that her humanity is always subordinated to her womanhood in her experience of British society in the 1790s. Burney's ironic stance towards Elinor also suggests the limits of the revolutionary politics she espouses. Elinor's seemingly feminist arguments often depend for their rhetorical power on denigrating other women. Instead of ameliorating the position of women in society, Burney suggests through Elinor's facile assumption that the opportunities given to her as a leisured woman are open to everyone, that such class bias disrupts feminist goals.

Elinor's final suicide attempt is theatrically Gothic. She again manipulates Harleigh and Ellis to meet with her, this time at a church, complete with her own headstone, proclaiming that, as she is 'sick of Life, of Love, and of Despair,/Dies to moulder, and be forgotten' (579). This third attempt, including Elinor dressed in a shroud, a scuffle between her and Harleigh over a pistol, and Ellis's flight in mingled embarrassment and despair, takes up only a few pages of this immense novel, highlighting the way in which Burney has subordinated Elinor's grand moments to Ellis's more practical trials. Indeed, Burney uses Elinor's first attempt on her life to comment upon the difficulties in the relationship between Ellis and Harleigh, the second extricates Ellis from the humiliation of performing in public, which also involved Harleigh's threat that the act was immodest and would result in a decisive split between them, and the third takes place as Ellis makes the decision to leave Mrs Ireton's service to seek work

independently in London. It again comments ironically on Ellis and Harleigh's relationship, as Ellis has misread Elinor's forged note, thinking it from her friend and future colleague Gabriella and not from Harleigh, as Elinor intended. Ellis is shocked that Harleigh, on the other hand, has assumed his forged note to be from her. In this misrecognition, Burney punctures Elinor's jealous sense of the romance between Ellis and Harleigh: for Ellis, Harleigh is more and more of an obstruction, even as, or because, she struggles to deny her feelings for him.

If both Elinor and Harleigh are unhelpful to Ellis in various ways, Burney shows the value of female friendship through Ellis's relationship with Gabriella. Burney's innovation is to show the strength and depth of this relationship in French, translating the women's conversations in a series of lengthy footnotes. Burney's inclusion of the warmest, most supportive friendship, based on an equal footing, and expressed in the French language, challenges her disclaimer of any 'foreign influence' in her prefatory address. It also belies modern accusations of straightforward conservatism. Anti-Jacobin novels laboured to show the insidious effects of French sensibility on English patriotism, for example, Julia's relationship with Vallaton in Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers*. Here, Burney shows the strength of friendship in French in sharp contrast to the shallowness of the English relationships represented in the novel. Ellis and Gabriella work together, first in Brighthelmstone, then in London, after Gabriella is forced to move there to search for news of her husband.

After the drudgery of work in the milliner's shop and at the mantua-maker's, and the continual humiliation of working for Mrs Ireton, Ellis and Gabriella's collaboration seems at first to offer a refreshing alternative: 'Juliet, by the side of Gabriella, thought every employment delightful; Gabriella, in the society of Juliet, felt every exertion lightened, and every sorrow softened' (624). Ellis and Gabriella's collaboration is beset, however, by fraudulent customers, financial demands, and their own inexperience of business, and later on by the agents of Ellis's brutal French husband in his own collaboration with Lord Denmeath. Doody argues that 'By showing her two émigrées keeping a haberdasher's shop, Burney deliberately divests them of some of the glamour that could still hang about a heroine doing embroidery' (*Frances Burney*, 358). Burney strips away the glamour surrounding many instances of labour in the novel. However, she shows this work in the haberdasher's shop to be full of revolutionary potential, even as it is beset by both prosaically financial and more narrative-driven difficulties. Gabriella both laments and defends her work to the curious Sir Jaspar Herrington:

Ah, Sir, the French Revolution has opened our eyes to a species of equality more rational, because more feasible, than that of lands or of rank; an equality not alone of mental sufferings, but of manual exertions. No state of life, however low, or however hard, has been left untried, either by the highest, or by the most delicate, in the various dispersions and desolation of the ancient French nobility.

(*The Wanderer*, 639)

Underneath Gabriella's bitter irony in this passage, there is a realisation that the acquisition of lands and rank is neither a rational nor a feasible route to equality. Her complaint – 'Alas! whence I come, all that are greatest, most ancient, and most noble, have learnt that self-exertion can alone mark nobility of soul; and that self-dependence can only sustain honour in adversity' (639) – also includes a celebration of those Burneyan virtues of hard work and independence. Gabriella laments the passing of the *ancien régime* at the same time as seeing the potential, however costly, of post-revolutionary life and work. Her comment on the 'dispersions and desolation of the ancient French nobility' also functions as a commentary on her friend Ellis's trajectory through British social strata.

Burney's third reiteration of female difficulties comes at the point in the novel when Ellis has fallen through the strata of English society and has been literally reduced to itinerant wandering. She meets a group of young women and enlists them to gain her a room in their parents' house. Burney comments on the employment of these girls: 'There was nothing in these young persons of sufficient "mark or livelihood" to make them attractive to Juliet; but she was glad to earn their good will; and not sorry to learn what were their occupations; conscious that a dearth of useful resources was a principal cause, in adversity, of FEMALE DIFFICULTIES' (*The Wanderer*, 693). One of Burney's feminist arguments in the novel focuses on the lack of opportunities for women to earn their own subsistence, and the concomitant injustices of working women's treatment by both upper- and lower-class society. This section of the novel muses on the hard life of the farmer, the pleasures and perils of poaching, and on the terrible contingency of working women's lives.

Ellis is finally tracked down by her brutal French husband and humiliated in front of Harleigh, who is paralysed by propriety into doing nothing to aid her obvious distress. Rescued instead by Sir Jaspar, Burney finally reveals the history of Ellis's marriage: she has been coerced into a forced marriage in order to save her guardian and protector the Bishop from the guillotine. The final section of *The Wanderer* anxiously works out ways for Ellis to escape this forced marriage and to marry instead Albert Harleigh. Johnson is scathingly critical of Burney's treatment of Ellis's first marriage:

We are assured, first, that her nuptial ceremony was secular, rushed, and curtailed; second, that she was forced into it; third, that she never consented to it even under compulsion; fourth, that the union was never consummated; and fifth, that her 'husband' is dead anyway. A textbook study in overdetermination, this surplus of explanation only confirms what the novel elsewhere challenges: a husband's right over the person of his wife.

(*Equivocal Beings*, 168–9)

Johnson focuses on the narrative strain Ellis's forced marriage exerts on the rest of the novel, frustrated at Burney's need to exculpate her heroine. On the other hand, Burney encodes in this overdetermined textual strategy the strain on

women in society to give in to sexual mores. The Admiral, revealed to be Ellis's uncle, tells her bluntly: 'For all I have no great goust to your marrying in that sort, God forbid I should uphold a wife in running away from her lawful spouse, even though he be a Frenchman!' (*The Wanderer*, 842). The Admiral's bluff Englishness has been lightly satirised by Burney throughout, but he remains a voice, however gently ridiculous, of patriarchal authority in the novel, and his blunt enforcement of marital hegemony explains the extremity of Burney's surplus excuses for Ellis's first marriage.

The happy conclusion to the novel depends upon this husband's death and the release and escape of the Bishop to Britain, circumstantially to the very shore Ellis had been on the point of embarking from for France. Relying heavily on coincidences, Burney makes the Admiral, as Ellis's uncle, demand a copy of the will legalising Granville's first marriage, legitimising Ellis. Ellis, now recognised as Juliet Granville, is able to marry Harleigh freely. Even so, she expresses concern over the fate of her friend Elinor. Harleigh reassures his lover: 'Fear her not! ... She has a noble, though, perhaps, a masculine spirit, and she will soon, probably, think of this affair only with pique and wonder' (862). Through the use of the word 'masculine' to describe Elinor, Harleigh emphasises Elinor's resemblance to female philosopher figures of the 1790s, and also highlights his similarity to the men who attacked women like Wollstonecraft and Hays as 'masculine' women, or unsex'd females. Specifically addressing her philosophy, he contends that Elinor has the intellectual capacity to see 'the fallacy of her new system', predicting that 'she will return to the habits of society and common life' (863). Harleigh seems to voice Burney's post-revolutionary concern for social stability here: he allows for Elinor's quality of mind to see beyond her revolutionary ardour and return to tried and tested social structures. He also recognises the performativity of Elinor's role in the novel: she has 'acted some strange and improbable part' – revolutionary politics as social performance. However, Burney herself concludes Elinor's story on a more ambivalent note. Informed by a letter from Harleigh of his marriage to Ellis, Elinor sinks into despair. Although Burney suggests that pride and time, 'the healer of woe', 'moderated her passions, in annihilating her expectations', she leaves Elinor 'in the anguish of her disappointment', her final words in the novel being:

'Alas! alas!' she cried, 'must Elinor too, – must even Elinor! – like the element to which, with the common herd, she owes, chiefly, her support, find, – with that herd! – her own level? – find that she has strayed from the beaten road, only to discover that all others are pathless!'

(873)

Elinor's story concludes with her still in a despair which mingles her class bias – her horror at finding herself 'with the common herd' – with existential dread. Far from returning her to 'the habits of society and common life', as Harleigh predicts, Burney leaves Elinor as another wanderer in a pathless desert.

The final reiteration of Burney's leitmotif closes the novel: 'Here, and thus felicitously, ended, with the acknowledgement of her name, and her family, the DIFFICULTIES of the WANDERER' (873). Burney goes on to characterise Ellis, the Wanderer, as 'a being who had been cast upon herself; a female Robinson Crusoe, as unaided and unprotected, though in the midst of the world, as that imaginary hero in his uninhabited island' (873). By stressing that a woman alone in the midst of the world is 'as unaided and unprotected' as a man on a desert island, Burney deepens her earlier social criticism, by connecting Ellis's alienation to Crusoe's loneliness. She makes it clear throughout the novel that Ellis's difficulties stem from the way in which her desire for independence is stymied by the actions of others. In her next paragraph, she lists the ways Ellis's endeavours have been subject to abuse and misapprehension throughout by the other characters in the novel: 'Her honour always in danger of being assailed, her delicacy of being offended, her strength of being exhausted, and her virtue of being calumniated!' (873). Burney's final paragraph ends optimistically by arguing that these difficulties 'are not insurmountable, where mental courage, operating through patience, prudence, and principle, supply physical force, combat disappointment, and keep untamed spirits superiour to failure, and ever alive to hope' (873). A hint of darkness returns in the choice presented by the narrator between sinking 'through inanition, to non-entity' or relying independently on one's own resources. As Ellis's experiences have shown the dangerously fragile nature of women's independence, there is a real fear of non-entity in this conclusion. This complicates William Hazlitt's criticism of Burney's novels and their focus on female difficulties: 'The difficulties in which she involves her heroines are indeed too much "Female Difficulties"; – they are difficulties created out of nothing'.²¹ Hazlitt's condemnation of Burney's obsessive testing of her heroines' propriety as 'difficulties created out of nothing' is only half-true. Burney's novels, particularly *The Wanderer*, are driven by a fear of *nothingness*: that without the recognition of her character, family and name, a woman is literally a non-entity.

Burney's treatment of the female philosopher figure remains uncertain throughout *The Wanderer*, depending upon her ambivalent engagement with Wollstonecraft's life and work. In Elinor, she fuses elements of Wollstonecraft's biography, particularly her suicide attempts but also Godwin's representation of his wife's religious scepticism, together with a caricatured version of the female philosopher, more consonant with the attacks on Mary Hays led by Elizabeth Hamilton. However, she also allows Elinor to voice trenchant social criticisms of women's position in society which go unchallenged in the novel, and her satire is undercut with real sympathy for Elinor's plight. Elinor's partially caricatured personality allows Burney to depict Ellis much more sympathetically, accessing Wollstonecraft's arguments to present the costs of social exclusion on Ellis's character. However, the contrived happy ending for Ellis

21 William Hazlitt, *Lectures on the English Comic Writers* (1819) in *Selected Writings of William Hazlitt*, vol. 5, ed. Duncan Wu (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1998), 113.

undermines Burney's earlier social critique, leaving the female philosopher figure, Elinor, lost in the wilderness.

**'Edward admired Fanny – George disliked her':
*Mansfield Park***

The Wanderer engages with post-revolutionary concerns over a woman's place in society, alternately challenging and acceding to a complex series of demands shaping women's personality and behaviour. Burney's novel strives to make sense of the violence of the French Revolution and reclaim its harsh lessons about the levelling qualities of revolutionary *égalité*, the deadening effects of women's labour and the complexities of gender relations for a changed and changing world. It explicitly alludes to Wollstonecraft's life and work, revealing Burney's sympathy for and anxiety about her feminist arguments: making her heroine Ellis, and later even Elinor, painfully aware of revolutionary feminism's limitations in the face of the increasingly strict enforcement of social obedience. Austen's *Mansfield Park* explores the psychological costs of demands for social stability in a turbulent world, encompassing in its uncompromising remit the complex pressures involved in female performance, the propriety or otherwise of bourgeois social mobility, and new pressures on plantation owners after the banning of the slave trade, with each distinct element used by Austen to comment obliquely on the others.²² Austen's engagement with Wollstonecraft, in this text, and throughout her work, remains circumspect, implicit and obfuscated. However, the ghosts of competing representations of the female

- 22 Critical attention on *Mansfield Park* has circled round Austen's engagement, or lack thereof, in contemporary debates around the slave trade and its abolition ever since the publication of Edward Said's influential essay, 'Jane Austen and Empire', arguing that Austen is implicated in the colonial underpinnings of the Bertrams' world. You-me Park and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, *The Postcolonial Jane Austen* devotes significant space to *Mansfield Park*, with essays by Donna Landry, Jon Mee, and Clara Tuite reading the novel as looking forward to 'Victorian notions of gender difference' ('Learning to Ride at *Mansfield Park*' in Park and Rajan, 56–73, 70), as sharing clear parallels with Hannah More's writing over Wollstonecraft's ('Austen's Treacherous Ivory: Female Patriotism, Domestic Ideology, and Empire' in Park and Rajan, 74–92, 80), and as 'conservative satire' ('Domestic Retrenchment and Imperial Expansion: The Property Plots of *Mansfield Park*' in You-me Park and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*, 93–115, 96–7), respectively. Katie Trumpener critiques Said's analysis of *Mansfield Park* as 'a remarkable, even prophetic, anticipation of imperial false consciousness' which misreads Austen's more liberal politics, (*Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 162). *Mansfield Park*'s moment of silence over the slave trade, then, functions as a microcosm of the wider debate over where to situate Austen's writing politically. Reading the Bertrams' silence as Austen's silence too collapses the novel into a conservative retrenchment of domestic values; reading it as her pointed comment on the moral vacuity of the Bertram family suggests a more radical critique of patriarchal society.

philosopher figure, and therefore, metonymically, Wollstonecraft herself, can be found in the contrasting characters of Fanny Price and Mary Crawford.

It remains uncertain how much, if any, of Wollstonecraft's work Austen had read. There are no references to Wollstonecraft in Austen's surviving letters and no explicit references to Wollstonecraft's infamous biography or radical philosophy in the novels. The letters censored by Cassandra Austen may have included references to Wollstonecraft's writing, but Austen's published novels seem to have gone through a process of self-censorship, refraining from either satirising or defending Wollstonecraft's feminist philosophy. Johnson argues that 'Wollstonecraft remained an unmentionable throughout Austen's career' (*Equivocal Beings*, 192), although she, and other critics, have read an engagement with Wollstonecraft running through Austen's work. Diane Hoeveler contends that '*Northanger Abbey* fictionalises the major points in Wollstonecraft's treatise [*Vindication of the Rights of Woman*], showing that women who are given inadequate educations will be victims of their own folly as well as of masculine hubris, lust, and greed'.²³ Knox-Shaw reads *Sense and Sensibility* together with *St. Leon* to draw out parallels between Godwin's progressive liberalism and Austen's liberal scepticism (see above). In *Pride and Prejudice*, Austen's satirical presentation of Mr Collins's reading Fordyce's *Sermons* implicitly alludes to Wollstonecraft's deconstruction of the sexual hypocrisy at work in eighteenth-century conduct-book literature, which focuses specifically on the minister's choice of text. According to Johnson, *Emma* 'actually succeeds at Wollstonecraft's grand aim better than Wollstonecraft did: diminishing the authority of male sentimentality, and reimmasculating men and women alike with a high sense of national purpose' (*Equivocal Beings*, 191). Knox-Shaw contrasts Austen's achievement in *Persuasion* with Wollstonecraft's revolutionary feminism. In his view, Austen avoids Wollstonecraft's imbrication in the dialectic of enlightenment which forces her into a 'virtually total abrogation (at the level of polemic) of existing womanhood' (*Jane Austen and the Enlightenment*, 241). Unlike Wollstonecraft, in his view, Austen 'insists on the value of strong feelings, on the excitement of sexual attraction, and on the dignity of those who show power to endure' (241). Knox-Shaw's comparison depends, as he concedes in a footnote, on contrasting Austen's successful defence of female desire with Wollstonecraft's failure to do so in her *Vindication*, ignoring the development of Wollstonecraft's ideas in her *Letters from Sweden* and *Maria*. Austen's success as a novelist is

23 See Diane Hoeveler, 'Vindicating *Northanger Abbey*: Mary Wollstonecraft, Jane Austen, and Gothic Feminism' in *Jane Austen and the Discourses of Feminism*, ed. Devoney Looser (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995), 117–35, 120. This interesting thesis is undermined by Hoeveler's bizarre claims, such as: 'If patriarchy did not exist, Wollstonecraft would have had to invent it to make her case for women' (120) and that Austen 'wants to be one of the boys' (133) by privileging Henry Tilney's sexist perspective at the conclusion of the novel. Her first claim is simply absurd: Wollstonecraft analysed patriarchal restrictions on women and campaigned against them; her second claim misreads Catherine Morland's identification with Henry for Austen's more questioning, even satirical, presentation of the novel's hero.

much more dependent than Knox-Shaw allows on Wollstonecraft's earlier work: that Austen manages to uphold 'women's active participation in the public world [at the same time as she] celebrates men's domestic activities in the private one' develops out of Wollstonecraft's textual legacy. Even if Austen is not herself directly drawing on Wollstonecraft's life and writing, which it seems to me she is doing implicitly throughout her career, Wollstonecraft's thinking on women's place and society – highly influential in the 1790s and, as I argued in my previous chapter, still significant in the early 1800s – lays the foundation for Austen's later satire.

Mansfield Park shares with Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Woman* an interest in the widest possible sense of female education – eschewing the shallow learning of Maria and Julia Bertram, Austen considers education as the way in which familial, social and cultural institutions combine to construct a human character, an insight she shares with Wollstonecraft. In her *Vindication*, Wollstonecraft analyses how social constraints on women sexualise them: literary, conduct-book representations of female inferiority combine with political legislation limiting a girl's access to education and opportunities to subordinate women's intellectual, physical and spiritual growth in relation to men's. For example, after analysing the representations of femininity in conduct-book literature, Wollstonecraft demands: 'Educated in the enervating style recommended by the writers on whom I have been animadverting; and not having a chance, from their subordinate state in society, to recover their lost ground, is it surprising that women every where appear a defect in nature?'²⁴ In Fanny Price, Austen both uses Wollstonecraft's critique of these conduct-book idealisations of femininity, by tracing the costs of this image on Fanny's physique and emotional development, and accesses positive representations of the female philosopher figure from 1790s debates in order to depict Fanny's intellectual growth, separate from revolutionary political concerns. In Mary Crawford, Austen utilises the negative representation of the female philosopher, again emptied of explicitly political content, in order to examine the sexualisation of Mary's character, also consonant with Wollstonecraft's arguments. Both of Austen's characters, therefore, act as contrasting iterations of the female philosopher figure, as well as being formed as characters by feminist debates of the 1790s.

Fanny's character is the focus of a sharply contested critical debate on whether she should be viewed as the moral centre of the novel, its subject, or the object of Austen's critical enquiry, and the implications for this on the novel's politics. Positioning Fanny as the text's moral arbiter tends to result in a

24 Mary Wollstonecraft, *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5, eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989), 185. Subsequent references, in-text. Wollstonecraft's representation of women as 'a defect in nature' riffs on Milton's characterisation of Eve in *Paradise Lost* as 'This fair defect/Of nature' (X. 891–2). She earlier attacks this phrase, asking, 'as a moralist, ... what is meant by such heterogeneous associations, as fair defects, amiable weaknesses, etc?' (*Vindication*, 103).

conservative reading of the text;²⁵ positioning her as the object of Austen's moral vision leads to a more radical reading.²⁶ My own reading sees Fanny as slipping between subject and object in the text: her often clear-sighted analysis of the moral failings of others is played off by the novel's narrative voice against the way in which Fanny's own fears, desires and sexual jealousies pervert her vision. This slippage explains the oblique, paradoxical nature of Austen's engagement with the figure of the female philosopher. Fanny is in part modelled on positive, Enlightenment versions of the female philosopher: firstly, she grows up to be a self-educated woman, guided by a male mentor in the ambivalent form of Edmund Bertram; secondly, she is able to generalise the ideas found in her reading into insightful statements, even if only addressed to herself and sometimes Edmund, about her position in the world; and, thirdly, she has a profound feeling of religious duty. Although she is crucially lacking a sense of political engagement, Austen uses her to make a subtly political point by also modelling her in part on the conduct-book idealisations of femininity critiqued by female philosophers such as Wollstonecraft and Hays. The resulting mixture disguises the extent to which Austen engages with the tradition of the female

25 Conservative readings of the text often conflate what are seen as Fanny's character weaknesses with failings in Austen's novelistic aesthetics. Kingsley Amis pinpoints many critics' personal animus against Fanny when he writes, 'Fanny's [feelings] are made odious by a self-regard utterly unredeemed by any humour' ('What Became of Jane Austen?' in *Sense and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Mansfield Park Casebook*, ed. B.C. Southam (London: Macmillan, 1976, 243–6, 243). Amis argues that Fanny's failings as a woman – selfishness, pathological passivity and aggressive piety – are also Austen's as a novelist, rather than seeing them as part of Austen's exploration of the societal inter- and intrapersonal pressures placed on Fanny by her subservient position within the text. Other critics follow Amis by reading Fanny's weaknesses as coextensive with Austen's aesthetics, rather than as part of Austen's social critique. For example, Landry reads Fanny's ill-health as 'the fatal weakness to which her proper – and dangerously rare – femininity is pathologically prone' ('Learning to Ride', 70), making Fanny's passivity part of her proper feminine subjectivity. Tuite goes even further, imagining Fanny as a figurehead of Austen's 'Tory feminism of upward bourgeois female mobility' ('Domestic Retrenchment', 96), missing in her pointed valorisation of Fanny's upward trajectory Austen's darker social commentary.

26 For an example of a more radical reading, see Margaret Kirkham, *Jane Austen: Feminism and Fiction* (London: The Athlone Press, 1997). Kirkham usefully questions Fanny's unappealing characteristics, pointing out that, in the context of the novel itself, her 'religiosity is an aspect of her sexiness'; whatever Amis and others make of her, Fanny is appealing to men in the novel: 'Fanny's physical fragility and her somewhat undeveloped, childish appearance contribute to making her seem close to the sentimental ideal of woman' (103). However, 'housed in the "beautiful little body", lurking behind the "soft light eyes", is a clear, critical, rationally-judging adult mind quite unlike the tractable, child-like mind of the true conduct-book heroine or sentimental novel' (105). In Kirkham's view, Austen has disguised an Enlightenment proto-feminist – connected, I argue, to earlier representations of the female philosopher as Enlightenment avatar – as an ideal conduct-book heroine. Although this view is beguiling, it understates the extent to which Austen distances herself from Fanny's combination of disguise and self-deceit.

philosopher figure at the same time as it allows her to access Wollstonecraftian arguments about the effect of idealised femininity on women's personalities. In her apolitical female philosopher role, Fanny functions as the subject of Austen's moral vision; with her conduct-book frailty, she works as its object.

Austen tracks the costs of Fanny's attempts to occupy the position of conduct-book heroine, at the same time aware of its psychopathological impact on the clarity of her critical, rationally judging adult mind. Indeed, in the 'Opinions of *Mansfield Park*' which Austen collected and transcribed from various friends and family, the recurring differences of opinion – for example, 'Fanny is a delightful character! ... Edward admired Fanny – George disliked her ... delighted with Fanny ... could not bear Fanny ... Thought Fanny insipid ... Fond of Fanny ...'²⁷ – suggests Austen's detached amusement: her friends and family, and her critics, have missed the point. Austen encourages her readers to empathise with Fanny at the same time as she demands a more impartial analysis of the forces which have formed her character. Fanny's double life as a conduct-book heroine, haunted by the spectre of the female philosopher, is particularly important in Austen's discussion of her education with the Bertrams, including her later monologue on memory; in her refusal to accept Henry Crawford's marriage proposal; and in her experiences when she is sent back to Portsmouth.

Austen's account of Fanny's education amongst the Bertram family portrays the costs on a young girl's physique and personality of living in a state of deliberate dependency. Fanny's painful feelings of alienation are exacerbated by Sir Thomas's haughty distance, Mrs Norris's bullying interference, and Maria and Julia's constant, subtle reminders of her inferiority. Sir Thomas and Mrs Norris discuss the manner in which Fanny should be educated when they are debating the propriety of inviting their niece to Mansfield Park. With dramatic irony, Mrs Norris reassures Sir Thomas that a relationship between Fanny and one of his sons would be 'morally impossible' as they would be brought up 'always together like brothers and sisters'.²⁸ She represents a characteristically mean and selfish view of the traditional aim of a girl's education when she argues: 'Give a girl an education, and introduce her properly into the world, and ten to one but she has the means of settling well, without farther expense to any body' (*Mansfield Park*, 8). For Mrs Norris, female education is solely a means for 'settling well'. Her emphasis on avoiding 'farther expense' also sets up her character as a miser. Sir Thomas also worries about Fanny's effect on her cousins, but reasons himself out of his concerns: her probable 'gross ignorance', 'meanness of opinions' and 'very distressing vulgarity of manner' are deemed 'not incurable faults' and not 'dangerous for her associates' (11). Austen reveals Sir Thomas's snobbery here: he automatically characterises his

27 'Various Opinions of *Mansfield Park*' in *Sense and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Mansfield Park Casebook*, ed. B.C. Southam (London: Macmillan, 1976), 200–5, 200–1.

28 Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park* (1814), ed. John Wiltshire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 8. Subsequent references, in-text.

wife's poorer family as ignorant, mean and vulgar. Indeed, Sir Thomas and Mrs Norris complacently believe that Fanny's association with Maria and Julia will benefit their cousin: 'It will be an education for the child ... only being with her cousins; if Miss Lee taught her nothing, she would learn to be good and clever from *them*' (11). This assertion is comically undermined by Lady Bertram's more directly selfish hope that 'she will not tease my poor pug ... I have but just got Julia to leave it alone' (11). Far from being good and clever, Julia and her older sister Maria are both revealed to be arrogant and ignorant; their shallow accomplishments always contrasted with Fanny's deeper understanding. Sir Thomas concludes contradictorily with the desire that his daughters and their cousin will be 'very good friends' although 'they cannot be equals. Their rank, fortune, rights, and expectations, will always be different' (12). Sir Thomas and Mrs Norris's discussion of Fanny's education concludes on this note of preserving the distinction between her and her cousins.

Wollstonecraft campaigns against these artificial distinctions in her *Vindication*, in which she argues that 'The preposterous distinctions of rank ... render civilization a curse, by dividing the world between voluptuous tyrants, and cunning envious dependents' (*Vindication*, 215). She argues that these distinctions 'corrupt, almost equally, every class of people, because respectability is not attached to the discharge of the relative duties of life, but to the station' (179). Although Sir Thomas is hardly 'voluptuous', he tyrannises his family, cowering his daughters especially through fear rather than basing his relationship with them on respect. Again, Fanny hardly seems to be one of Wollstonecraft's 'cunning envious dependents'. However, Austen constantly shows Maria and Julia's relationship with each other and their father to be based on both cunning and envy, and traces the limitations of the Bertram family's 'discharge of the relative duties of life', their affections for each other, and their virtuous behaviour. Echoing Wollstonecraft, Austen shows how Sir Thomas and Mrs Norris's preservation of the distinction between Fanny and her cousins corrupts Maria and Julia as much as it oppresses Fanny. Austen accesses Wollstonecraft's critique of the way in which artificial distinctions corrupt the public sphere to show that it also functions in private, with distinctions imposed within families causing personal suffering and moral stagnation. Further, Claudia Johnson argues that Austen 'is at pains to employ the Burkean vocabulary of the political sublime in order to describe the sexually differentiated dynamics of the Bertram household' in order to show the failure of the conservative description of paternal authority (*Jane Austen*, 97). I argue that Austen accesses Wollstonecraft's arguments to counter the artificial distinctions in personal and political life advocated by Burke. This makes Fanny's later conflict with Sir Thomas an echo of Wollstonecraft's confrontations with Burke in print.

Austen suggests that this oppression accounts for Fanny's lack of bodily strength and her painful shyness when she first arrives at Mansfield Park. In Portsmouth she 'had always been important as play-fellow, instructress, and nurse' (*Mansfield Park*, 16) to her brothers and sisters, suggesting a more active, playful childhood than the example of either Lady Bertram's passive existence

or Mrs Norris's more laborious regime. She had also relied upon her elder brother William to be 'her advocate with her mother', suggesting that the meek obedience she displays towards the Bertrams has not always been her defining characteristic. Fanny's upbringing at Portsmouth, hinted at here, suggests an education more in line with Wollstonecraft's suggestion that girls and boys should be allowed to play and learn together than the more traditional pedagogy she experiences at Mansfield Park. Maria and Julia are scornful of Fanny's lack of a polished education, reporting to their mother and aunt that Fanny is deficient in geography, art, history, and science, remarking, 'How strange! – Did you ever hear any thing so stupid?' (20). Instead of rebuking Maria and Julia for their rudeness, Mrs Norris complacently praises their 'wonderful memories' in comparison to Fanny who 'has probably none at all' (21). She also insists on her earlier determination that it is better that the Bertram daughters acquire accomplishments which show the difference between them and Fanny's 'great want of genius and emulation' (21). Austen caustically comments:

Such were the counsels by which Mrs Norris assisted to form her nieces' minds; and it is not very wonderful that with all their promising talents and early information, they should be entirely deficient in the less common acquirements of self-knowledge, generosity, and humility. In every thing but disposition, they were admirably taught.

(21–2)

The distinctions insisted upon by Mrs Norris render Maria and Julia 'entirely deficient' in humanity towards themselves and others. Austen also questions 'their promising talents and early information' by underscoring that the Bertram daughters' accomplishments are learned by rote rather than understood or valued.

Both Sir Thomas and Lady Bertram are also implicated in the deficiencies of their daughters' education. Sir Thomas does not realise that their education is 'wanting, because, though a truly anxious father, he was not outwardly affectionate, and the reserve of his manner repressed all the flow of their spirits before him' (22). Lady Bertram resembles Wollstonecraft's description of a rich woman who nurses her dogs 'with a parade of sensibility, when sick' but 'will suffer her babes to grow up crooked in a nursery' (*Vindication*, 244) when Austen writes: 'To the education of her daughters, Lady Bertram paid not the smallest attention. She had not time for such cares. She was a woman who spent her days in sitting nicely dressed on a sofa, ... thinking more of her pug than her children' (*Mansfield Park*, 22). Wollstonecraft's accusation that the 'wife, mother, and human creature, were all swallowed up by the factitious character which an improper education and the selfish vanity of beauty had produced' (*Vindication*, 244–5) is given a comic twist in Austen's presentation of Lady Bertram. In being 'guided in every thing important by Sir Thomas', Lady Bertram embodies Wollstonecraft's critique of the fashionable wife and mother.

Austen contrasts Maria and Julia's rote-learning with Fanny's more complex engagement with education and memory later in the novel. Commenting on Mrs Grant's shrubbery, Fanny wonders:

Three years ago, this was nothing but a rough hedgerow along the upper side of the field, never thought of as any thing, or capable of becoming any thing; and now it is converted into a walk, and it would be difficult to say whether most valuable as a convenience or an ornament.

(*Mansfield Park*, 243)

Fanny's musing on the change in the shrubbery also seems to gauge changes in her own character, developing from a girl 'never thought of as any thing, or capable of becoming any thing' into a polished young woman. After exclaiming, 'How wonderful, how very wonderful the operations of time, and the changes of the human mind!' (243), she continues:

If any one faculty of our nature may be called *more* wonderful than the rest, I do think it is memory. There seems something more speakingly incomprehensible in the powers, the failures, the inequalities of memory, than in any other of our intelligences. The memory is sometimes so retentive, so serviceable, so obedient – at others, so bewildered and so weak – and at others again, so tyrannic, so beyond controul! – We are to be sure a miracle every way – but our powers of recollecting and of forgetting, do seem peculiarly past finding out.

(243)

In this monologue, Fanny reveals her intelligence and abilities, at least to her readers; her auditor, Mary Crawford 'untouched and inattentive, had nothing to say' (243). Fanny is persistently underrated by the Bertram family and their circle, because they do not actually listen to her. She has not only caught up with Maria and Julia in terms of 'early information' but surpassed them in her ability to generalise her ideas. Her disquisition on memory here connects her to the eighteenth-century tradition celebrating the female philosopher discussed in my introduction: she combines intellectual sophistication with modesty and decorum. As with Mrs Grant's shrubbery, Fanny's dissertation on memory also seems to refer, perhaps unconsciously, to herself. Like memory, she is 'so retentive, so serviceable, so obedient' to the Bertrams' demands, as well as sometimes bewildered and weak. If she is herself neither 'tyrannic' nor 'beyond controul', she is painfully aware of both the difficult demands that are placed on her and on the related, equally damaging freedoms of her cousins. The language Austen has Fanny use in her unheeded soliloquy on memory – inequalities, obedience, tyrannic, controul – seems also to comment obliquely on the post-revolutionary culture of Britain: encapsulating fears over social unrest, governmental heavy-handedness, and the developing discourse of polite decorum, particularly restricting women's expression. Like *The Wanderer*, *Mansfield Park* takes

part in a later reformulation of the lived experience of the French Revolution followed by the Napoleonic wars: a balancing of concerns for social stability with an analysis of the effects of this on an individual's psyche. Whereas *The Wanderer* explicitly confronts the aftermath of the French Revolution in Britain, *Mansfield Park* approaches its historical context indirectly and allusively.

Austen contrasts the way in which Sir Thomas deals with his daughter Maria's engagement to Rushworth with his treatment of Fanny after Henry has proposed to her. These connected scenes allow Austen to make a modest feminist point through Fanny's refusal and a more satirical argument about the consequences of Maria's acquiescence. Sir Thomas's discussion with Maria about her impending marriage to Rushworth exposes both his own flaws as a parent and the forces at work leading Maria to misrepresent her views about the match. Sir Thomas observes that 'indifference was the most favourable state they could be in. Her behaviour to Mr Rushworth was careless and cold. She could not, did not like him' (233–4). He decides to question her about her feelings, arguing to himself: 'Advantageous as would be the alliance, and long standing and public as was the engagement, her happiness must not be sacrificed to it' (234). Austen shows how these noble intentions are subverted both by Sir Thomas's complacency and Maria's mixture of fear of him and unexpressed desire, partially for Henry but more particularly for independence. Maria responds after 'a moment's struggle ... and only a moment's ... immediately, decidedly, and with no apparent agitation' that she had not 'the smallest desire of breaking through her engagement, or was sensible of any change of opinion or inclination since her forming it' (234).

Austen analyses Sir Thomas's reasons for accepting such obvious untruths and Maria's for giving them. Sir Thomas is 'satisfied; too glad to be satisfied perhaps to urge the matter quite so far as his judgement might have dictated to others' (234). He is too quick to be satisfied because relinquishing the alliance would lead to social embarrassment. He also decides that Maria's 'feelings probably were not acute' (234) and that a wife not in love with her husband 'was in general but the more attached to her own family' (235). Austen caustically dismisses Sir Thomas's casuistry as 'Such and such-like were the reasonings of Sir Thomas', concluding that he was 'very happy to think any thing of his daughter's disposition that was most favourable for the purpose' (235). Sir Thomas has wilfully misread Maria's real feelings to ensure an easy way out of a potentially difficult situation. The reasons behind Maria's deliberate deception hinge on spite towards Henry Crawford. By pledging herself to Rushworth, she 'was safe from the possibility of giving Crawford the triumph of governing her actions, and destroying her prospects' (235); he had 'destroyed her happiness, but he should not know that he had done it; he should not destroy her credit, her appearance, her prosperity too' (236). Ironically, her affair with Henry which acts as the novel's climax will destroy exactly these things. She also craves independence: 'more needful than ever; the want of it at Mansfield more sensibly felt'. Her marriage to Rushworth gives her an escape from 'the

restraint which her father imposed' (236). This discussion between father and daughter reveals the bad faith between them: Sir Thomas complacently acquiesces to Maria's untruths to avoid embarrassment and increase his sense of social respectability through the match, irrespective of his daughter's real happiness; Maria performs her part in the charade to escape Sir Thomas's stultifying presence and to pettily revenge herself on Henry. Austen sums up Maria's precipitate desire to marry Rushworth thus: 'In all the important preparations of the mind she was complete; being prepared for matrimony by an hatred of home, restraint, and tranquillity; by the misery of disappointed affection, and contempt of the man she was to marry. The rest might wait' (236). Austen ironically echoes Wollstonecraft's demands that women be intellectually and morally prepared for marriage by improved education in her subversive catalogue of Maria's preparations.

The dialogue between Sir Thomas and Fanny upon Henry's proposal to her reflects this earlier discussion between Maria and her father, underscoring the differences between Fanny and Maria, and explicating Maria's unwillingness to disappoint her father's expectations. Fanny honestly expresses her refusal of Henry's suit which leads to a shocked harangue from Sir Thomas. Sir Thomas, after reassuring himself, incorrectly, that Fanny is not in love with either of her cousins, demands: 'Have you any reason, child, to think ill of Mr Crawford's temper?' (366). Fanny replies 'No, Sir', but Austen continues: 'She longed to add, "but to his principles I have"' (366). She avoids doing so because a discussion of Henry's principles would lead to revelations about Maria and Julia's misconduct with him. In the absence of any explanation from Fanny, Sir Thomas attacks her own conduct: 'I had thought you peculiarly free from wilfulness of temper, self-conceit, and every tendency to that independence of spirit, which prevails so much in modern days, even in young women, and which in young women is offensive and disgusting beyond all common offence' (367). Sir Thomas's accusation that Fanny is wilful, selfish and independent exactly echoes Austen's characterisation of Maria's decision to marry Rushworth. He is also treating Fanny as if she were behaving like a female philosopher figure such as Harriet Freke in Edgeworth's *Belinda* and Bridgetina Botherim or Julia Delmond in Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers*. Austen contrasts Sir Thomas's complacency at Maria's dishonesty with his outrage at Fanny's honest rejection of Henry here.

In her discussion with Edmund about her refusal of Henry, Fanny makes a considered statement of a moderate kind of feminism, referring to Mary and Mrs Grant's disbelief that she has rejected their brother:

I *should* have thought ... that every woman must have felt the possibility of a man's not being approved, not being loved by some one of her sex, at least, let him be ever so agreeable. Let him have all the perfections in the world, I think it ought not to be set down as certain, that a man must be acceptable to every woman he may happen to like himself.

(408, original emphasis)

Fanny is fighting for the right to say ‘no’, distinguishing her from both satirical versions of the female philosopher and from her revolutionary iteration in Hays’s Emma Courtney, who struggle for the justification to pursue their own sexual partners. Still, she expresses herself in the considered, rational mode of an Enlightenment female philosopher, connecting her with each of these earlier traditions of female philosophy. Edmund misunderstands Fanny’s arguments, deciding that it is Fanny’s surprise at the ‘novelty’ (409) of Henry’s suit rather than Fanny’s disinclination towards him which explains Fanny’s refusal, adding an encomium on Miss Crawford’s ‘liveliness’ which pains Fanny further – her unexpressed desire for Edmund himself being one of the major reasons for her dislike of Henry.

Sir Thomas’s decision to send Fanny back to Portsmouth in order to make her miss Henry and ‘the elegancies and luxuries of Mansfield Park’ (425) completes Fanny’s development into the novel’s positive, if still partial, female philosopher figure. Her initial horror at the confined space of her Portsmouth home, her uncouth father, neglectful mother and squabbling brothers leads her to conclude ‘that though Mansfield Park might have some pains, Portsmouth could have no pleasures’ (454), self-consciously echoing Samuel Johnson on matrimony and celibacy in *Rasselas*.²⁹ However, Fanny finds some consolations in Portsmouth: first of all, her sister Susan, who she perceives is attempting to remedy their family’s chaotic lifestyle, in a manner at odds with Fanny’s more passive personality but agreeing with her moral certitude. Realising that Susan looks up to her, Fanny decides to resolve an argument between Susan and their other sister Betsey by giving the younger girl a knife – a rather sinister gift – to stop her coveting Susan’s and enjoys the sense of being useful ‘to a mind so much in need of help, and so much deserving it’ (460). Secondly, she subscribes to Portsmouth’s circulating library ‘amazed at being anything *in propria persona*, amazed at her own doings in every way; to be a renter, a chuser of books!’ (461). Finally, connecting the two, she decides to educate Susan, to ‘inspire a taste for the biography and poetry which she delighted in herself’ (461). Portsmouth gives Fanny a much needed sense of personal agency: she learns to take care of her sister, respecting Susan’s more active personality, and decides to improve her sister as she believes Edmund has improved her. Fanny’s education of Susan completes Austen’s analysis of female education in the novel, offering a different model of female behaviour from Fanny’s passive suffering in Susan’s decisive action. This focus on sisterly support and education provides a more positive model of female agency than Fanny’s earlier passivity and the intemperance of the Bertram sisters and Mary Crawford. Although stripped of explicit political engagement, Austen accesses earlier, positive models of female philosophy in her representation of Fanny, and, crucially, shows Fanny passing her hard-won lessons of female self-reliance on to her sister.

29 In a discussion between *Rasselas* and his sister, the Princess Nekayah argues that ‘Marriage has many pains, but celibacy has no pleasures’. Samuel Johnson, *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia* (1759), ed. Thomas Keymer (Oxford: Oxford’s World Classics, 2009), 59.

Like *Belinda*, *Modern Philosophers* and *The Wanderer*, *Mansfield Park* also includes a negative role model of female behaviour, linked to the counter-revolutionary example of the female philosopher, Mary Crawford, who is the object of Austen's critical appraisal. Mary fulfils a similar function in her novel as Harriet Freke, Bridgetina Botherim and Elinor Joddrell do in theirs. By satirising the character flaws of these women, Edgeworth, Hamilton, Burney and Austen create a space for a more positive heroine with whom they can make a range of feminist arguments, whilst remaining distant from both Wollstonecraft's reputation and the counter-revolutionary suspicion of the female philosopher figure.³⁰ In *Mansfield Park*, Austen's representation of Fanny and Mary is the more complex, because she makes Mary's character and actions so attractive and entertaining, and Fanny's both oppressed and oppressive, effectively reversing the trope of contrasting female philosopher figures in order to explore the ramifications of it. Like Harriet, Bridgetina and Elinor, Mary is both a figure of fun (both satirised and funny herself) in the novel and a more threatening presence, and she is also exiled from the novel at its conclusion, like these women before her. Mary actively pursues the object of her affections; this pursuit reveals her calculating insights into the marriage market, at least to the increasingly jealous Fanny, and, through her, the reader. Instead of promulgating revolutionary dogma, like Harriet or Bridgetina, Mary makes a series of risqué jokes, sexualised comments and knowing references, criticised as inappropriate by both Edmund and Fanny, until she unforgivably fails to condemn her brother Henry's affair with Maria, leading to her exclusion from the novel. By depoliticising the counter-revolutionary representation of the female philosopher in Mary Crawford, Austen may seem to have made her unthreatening. On the other hand, unlike Harriet and Bridgetina, who are both figured as repulsive in manners and appearance, Mary remains dangerously attractive throughout *Mansfield Park* – Edmund is seduced by her beauty and grace, and these aspects of her character are experienced as threatening to Fanny.

Mary is introduced into the novel explicitly seeking a good marriage, encouraged by Mrs Grant who 'had fixed on Tom Bertram' (48) as a suitable match for her sister. Mary entertains Mrs Grant's scheme, although her focus quickly shifts to the younger Edmund: 'Matrimony was her object, provided she could marry well, and having seen Mr. Bertram in town, she knew that objection could no more be made to his person than to his situation in life. While she treated it as a joke, therefore, she did not forget to think of it seriously' (48). Austen's last line here encapsulates Mary's approach not only to marriage but to the social whirl of the Bertrams' existence: her behaviour deliberately makes light of what she considers deeply. Mary's closing remarks on marriage sum up her combination of jokiness and calculation: 'I would have every body marry if

30 Claudia Johnson argues that Austen has already accessed this tradition of contrasting female philosopher figures in *Pride and Prejudice*, in which Lydia Bennett's outrageous antics act as a cover for Elizabeth's own subversions of properly feminine behaviour, in *Jane Austen*, 76.

they can do it properly; I do not like to have people throw themselves away; but every body should marry as soon as they can do it to advantage' (50). Mary's focus on marrying well, rather than the explicitly political concerns of counter-revolutionary female philosopher figures, exemplifies Austen's post-revolutionary approach to the figure of the female philosopher in her fiction: Mary, Fanny, and the whole plot of *Mansfield Park*, are deliberately situated after the revolutionary conflict between English Jacobin and Anti-Jacobin concerns. The active expression of female desire, argued for by Emma Courtney, Harriet Freke and Bridgetina Botherim, is stripped of its revolutionary overtones in Mary's case and reformulated as aggressive husband-hunting.

Harriet and Bridgetina's warped logic and garbled revolutionary declarations are reconfigured in Mary's frequent faux-pas. She playfully critiques the modern manners of one of Tom Bertram's female admirers, a Miss Anderson, who pretended shyness in private, only to be demonstratively affectionate in public, concluding 'I do not pretend to set people right, but I do see that they are often wrong' (58). Tom gallantly replies: 'Those who are shewing the world what female manners *should be* ... are doing a great deal to set them right' (58, emphasis in original). The 'less courteous' Edmund replies: 'The error is plain enough ... such girls are ill brought up. They are given wrong notions from the beginning. They are always acting upon motives of vanity – and there is no more real modesty in their behaviour *before* they appear in public than afterwards' (58, emphasis in original). This brief discussion between Mary, Tom and Edmund uncovers their different perspectives on female manners: Mary uses Tom's anecdote of the socially maladroit Miss Anderson to flirt with both Bertrams, accidentally revealing her own ambivalent approach to female manners – she sees the impropriety of Miss Anderson's actions but uses it for comic effect; Tom also uses the anecdote to flirt with Mary, complimenting her on her superior manners; Edmund, however, takes a higher-minded moral approach – effectively spoiling the flirtatious atmosphere – by seriously criticising Miss Anderson's false modesty. His approach echoes Wollstonecraft's critique of hypocritical courtship behaviour in her *Vindication* in which she argues 'Did women really respect virtue for its own sake, they would not seek for a compensation in vanity' (*Vindication*, 209). Indeed, as Hamilton puts her most active defence of Wollstonecraft's ideas into her male hero's mouth, so too does Austen make Edmund her most consistently Wollstonecraftian figure in *Mansfield Park*.

Edmund also regrets Mary's flippant attitude towards her uncle, her thinly veiled joke about homosexuality in the Admiralty – 'Of *Rears*, and *Vices*, I saw enough. Now, do not be suspecting me of a pun, I entreat' (71, original emphasis), and other lapses in taste, although he refuses to rebuke her directly, instead criticising her to his admiring confidante, Fanny. Mary also makes more serious blunders, especially criticising the clergy, before she realises that Edmund is training to be a priest. Her dislike of his vocation remains a major stumbling block in their relationship, which Edmund finally ends when Mary refuses to condemn her brother's self-destructive affair with Maria Bertram.

Edmund recounts his offended delicacy at Mary's refusal to take the adultery in Henry and Maria's affair as anything more than folly to Fanny, who listens with a mixture of 'curiosity and concern, ... pain and ... delight' (525) at the demise of her rival in Edmund's affections. Fanny calls Mary's behaviour 'cruel ... to give way to gaiety and to speak with lightness, and to you! – Absolute cruelty' (527), which Edmund rejects, arguing instead that Mary's flaws are not 'faults of temper' but 'faults of principle, ... of blunted delicacy and a corrupted, vitiated mind' (527–8). Edmund's analysis of Mary's character flaws focuses on her early upbringing by her immoral Admiral uncle, revealing the cost of her early association with free living on her manners and morals. Here again, Edmund echoes Wollstonecraft's examination of the character weaknesses resulting from early association of ideas. In the concluding chapter of *Mansfield Park*, discussed in more detail below, Austen reveals that Mary 'lived together' with her sister Mrs Grant, and that after the death of Dr Grant, 'they still lived together', as Mary had been unable to find a suitable match for herself 'who could satisfy the better taste she had acquired at Mansfield ... or put Edmund Bertram sufficiently out of her head' (543). Mary finishes the novel in a surprisingly similar position to Bridgetina Botherim: still single and in the domestic setting of the home – underscoring her connection to the counter-revolutionary female philosopher figure.

The Bertrams' performance of Elizabeth Inchbald's translation of August von Kotzebue's *Lovers' Vows* distinguishes Austen's post-revolutionary perspective from radical writing of the 1790s and the Anti-Jacobin reaction to it of the early nineteenth century. It allows Austen to study the developing relationships between the various characters in her novel, especially Edmund, Fanny and Mary, ironically and subversively charting them in relation to the revolutionary drama they choose to put on. Penny Gay convincingly argues that 'in this most apparently anti-theatrical of her novels, Jane Austen employs the methods of the drama with brilliant panache'³¹ in order to 'alert the reader to the moral ambiguity pervading the highly theatricalised society that she anatomises' (*Jane Austen and the Theatre*, 103). Austen's use of *Lovers' Vows* is less anti-theatre, therefore, and much more a tool used to discover and criticise the inherent theatricality, the obsession with appearance, which permeates the personalities of the Bertrams and their circle of friends, particularly Henry and Mary Crawford. Gay moves beyond the way in which *Lovers' Vows* 'can be used to support both a conservative and a radical reading of the novel' (107), contrasting Kotzebue's position as 'an obvious whipping-boy for the anti-Jacobins' given his foreignness and revolutionary sympathies with Austen's approach to Kotzebue's radicalism in her subversion of class boundaries (105). She concludes that 'Inchbald's play is ultimately most useful to Austen, not for its quotably subversive politics, but because it provides two strong female parts in scenes which suit perfectly the development of plot, character, and theme in this novel'

31 Penny Gay, *Jane Austen and the Theatre* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 98. Subsequent references, in-text.

(107). Gay's bipartisan focus shows Austen ceding interpretative authority to her readers, by leaving her political sympathies open to competing exegesis.

Lovers' Vows allows Austen to play with the relationship between Edmund Bertram and Mary Crawford, with Fanny acting first as a jealous bystander then cajoled into the role of Cottager's Wife – reflecting, in a darkly comic mode, on her low social status. Mary cleverly manipulates Edmund into the role of her character Amelia's tutor, Anhalt, by introducing the idea of a neighbour taking on the role. Edmund's decision to take the role himself is rationalised by him as one of propriety, keeping the private theatricals within the immediate family circle, although it also relates to his increasing admiration of, and desire for, Mary. Austen uses the rehearsals for the play to reveal Edmund and Mary's shared desire, and Fanny's for Edmund, when she brings first Mary, then Edmund, to Fanny in order to rehearse a key scene between Anhalt and Amelia. Act III Scene 2 of *Lovers' Vows* sees Anhalt, as Amelia's tutor and her father's trusted advisor, sent to Amelia to counsel her to marry Count Cassel as her father's wishes decree. This mission is complicated by Anhalt and Amelia's illicit love for each other. The couple's scene together sees Amelia propose marriage to Anhalt instead, after Anhalt has set forth two visions of marriage, one happy and the other not. Austen's use of *Lovers' Vows* plays intertextually with these two views: in the first 'two sympathetic hearts' combine 'Patience and love', leaving 'melancholy and discord ... far behind'³²; in the second, Anhalt argues that 'When convenience, and fair appearance joined to folly and ill humour, forge the fetters of matrimony, they gall with their weight the married pair' (*Lovers' Vows*, 592). In performing this scene in *Mansfield Park*, Edmund and Mary play out their unspoken wishes for the first vision of marriage but their relationship is also coloured by the unhappiness in the play's second version. Austen hints here that the folly and ill humour of this version may have dogged their potential union, which does upset the marriages of Maria Bertram and Mr Rushworth, and Julia's with Mr Yates.

Austen's use of *Lovers' Vows* does not simply condemn the impropriety of the Bertrams' performance of the radical play in their father's absence, but uses it intertextually to comment on the young people's present desires and future fates. Austen's complex treatment of Kotzebue's play differs sharply from Hannah More's more straightforward condemnation of the German playwright in her *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*, complicating the clear parallels Mee sees between Austen's novel and More's counter-revolutionary conduct book ('Austen's Treacherous Ivory', 80). More lambasts Kotzebue's immensely popular *The Stranger* as the 'first attempt at representing an adultress [sic] in an exemplary light',³³ suggestively linking the

32 Elizabeth Inchbald, *Lovers' Vows; A Play, in Five Acts; Altered from the German of Kotzebue* (1798) in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 5, ed. John Wiltshire (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 591–2. Subsequent references, in-text.

33 Hannah More, *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education* (London: T. Cadell Jun. and W. Davies, 1799), 48. Subsequent references, in-text.

play with Wollstonecraft's posthumous novel, *Maria*. More argues that the two publications form an 'aera in manners', as, at the same time as Kotzebue's play,

a direct vindication of adultery was for the first time attempted by a *woman*, a professed admirer and imitator of the German suicide Werter. *The female Werter*, as she is styled by her biographer, asserts, in a work intitled 'The Wrongs of Women,' [sic] that adultery is justifiable, and that the restrictions placed on it by the laws of England constitute one of the *Wrongs of Women*.

(*Strictures*, 48, original emphases)

More criticises Kotzebue's play and Wollstonecraft's novel, along with Godwin's biography, as both apologising for and encouraging adultery. Although Austen's conclusion, with its extended discussion of the effects of various adulteries on the Bertram family, could be said to parallel More's didacticism, her choice of a different Kotzebue play, which she uses sympathetically to develop her own points about marriage as well as to further her satire on social appearance, and her refusal to connect her criticisms to Wollstonecraft, suggest a more complex engagement with both German drama and revolutionary feminism than More's straightforward antipathy. Mary Waldron analyses Austen and More's contrasting literary techniques, arguing that Austen's ambivalent relationship with the Evangelical movement distinguishes her fiction from More's, whose writing functions as more straightforward propaganda for the Evangelicals. In contrast to More's *Coelebs in Search of a Wife*, *Mansfield Park*, according to Waldron, 'aims to counteract an increasing tendency for fiction to sermonise through ideal object-lessons'.³⁴ Although I find Waldron's analysis convincing, I would add that borrowing tropes from Evangelical fiction, particularly Fanny and Edmund's focus on 'principles', allows Austen to mount a wide-ranging assault on social hypocrisy in the novel's conclusion.

Mansfield Park climaxes in a series of scandals involving the Bertram sisters, implicating both in adultery. Austen's treatment of adultery reflects upon earlier discussions across the political divide, particularly competing ideas of adultery in the works of Wollstonecraft and Hannah More. More argues that an adulteress is a character 'which, in all periods of the world, ancient as well as modern, in all countries, heathen as well as christian [sic], has hitherto been held in detestation, and has never been introduced but to be reprobated' (46). She criticises Kotzebue for encouraging his audience 'anxiously to wish to see an adultress restored to that rank of women who have not violated the most solemn covenant that can be made with man, nor disobeyed one of the most positive laws which has been enjoined by God' (47). More's condemnation of adultery is both echoed and challenged by Austen's concluding remarks. Her opening statement, 'Let other pens dwell on guilt and misery. I quit such odious subjects as soon as

34 Mary Waldron, *Jane Austen and the Fiction of Her Time* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), (86).

I can, impatient to restore every body, not greatly in fault themselves, to tolerable comfort, and to have done with all the rest' (*Mansfield Park*, 533), seems to distance her from the strict morality of More. However, the rest of the chapter dwells on exactly the guilt and misery Austen has just disavowed. She is even suggestively critical of Fanny. Her next paragraph begins: 'My Fanny indeed at this very time, I have the satisfaction of knowing, must have been happy in spite of everything. She must have been a happy creature in spite of all she felt *or thought she felt*, for the distress of those around her' (533, my emphasis). Austen's conscientious addition, 'or thought she felt', suggests Fanny's supposed empathy for the Bertrams and Crawfords is an act, even if it is an act Fanny is not really aware of herself. Austen's repetition of 'in spite of' also links Fanny's happiness with a suggestion of spitefulness: her happiness depends on Schadenfreude. Austen's final chapter continues with an analysis of the moral failings of the Bertram circle. Austen banishes the adulterous Maria, accompanied by Mrs Norris, because Sir Thomas refuses to countenance her return to Mansfield Park. Maria's banishment, in line with conventional morality, is leavened with an analysis of the inappropriate nature of her education, imputed by Austen to Sir Thomas's poor management of his family. Maria's adultery is not simply treated as her individual contravention of social mores, which must be punished, but as the product of her deficient education, obsessed with the appearance rather than the achievement of virtue. Austen also condemns Mr Rushworth for marrying Maria when he was aware that she loved another: 'The indignities of stupidity, and the disappointments of selfish passion, can excite little pity. His punishment followed his conduct, as did a deeper punishment, the deeper guilt of his wife' (537). Austen hints at the unfairness of Rushworth's ability, after his divorce, to enter into matrimony again, suggesting the likelihood that he would again be 'duped' into believing in his wife's affections, whereas Maria 'must withdraw with infinitely stronger feelings to a retirement and reproach, which could allow no second spring of hope or character' (537). Austen continues her criticism of the inequalities in society's dealings with men and women who have contravened social mores in her treatment of Henry Crawford. Dealing with Henry's deliberate seduction of Maria Rushworth, Austen drily notes: 'That punishment, the public punishment of disgrace, should in a just measure attend *his* share of the offence, is, we know, not one of the barriers, which society gives to virtue. In this world, the penalty is less equal than could be wished' (542, original emphasis). The inequality of society's treatment of men and women allows Henry, and Rushworth, to avoid the public disgrace attendant on Maria's behaviour. Austen's criticisms here distance her from More's work, which focuses on women's misdemeanour without considering men's.

Both *Mansfield Park* and *The Wanderer* engage with contentious issues from the literature of the 1790s, especially female education, marriage and women's position in between public and private spheres, meaning that Wollstonecraft is an unavoidable precursor figure for both texts. Burney's engagement with Wollstonecraft remains ambivalent, at least partially caricaturing elements of her life and writing through Elinor, whilst accessing Wollstonecraft's feminist

arguments in her depiction of Ellis. Austen's relationship towards Wollstonecraft's feminist critique of female education and social hypocrisy is both more implicit and more assured, making Fanny into a surprisingly successful female philosopher figure: she is able to articulate a limited feminism and, importantly, passes on her hard-fought lessons of self-reliance to her more active, younger sister. Austen's engagement with Wollstonecraftian concerns reveals the extent to which revolutionary ideas about women's rights, female education and potential for social improvement have been naturalised by the early 1810s. In *Mansfield Park*, Austen is able to present Wollstonecraft's controversial arguments in the mild, decorous voice of her narrator, allied to Fanny Price's intense interiority.

1814, the year both novels were published, is also a crucial year in the life of Mary Shelley, the subject of my next chapter: as Austen and Burney negotiated the waning influence of the female philosopher in their fiction, Mary Wollstonecraft Godwin was preparing to begin her literary career, in a series of letters and journal entries documenting her journey across war-ravaged Europe with her lover Percy Bysshe Shelley and step-sister Claire Clairmont, which would be later published as *History of a Six Weeks' Tour* (1816). Mary Shelley's writing implicitly and explicitly confronts the fate of the female philosopher through her own, personal, intellectual and textual engagement with Wollstonecraft, much closer than either Austen or Burney's. Throughout her work, Mary Shelley reformulates the female philosopher for the reading audiences of the 1820s and 1830s in the different literary genres of the Gothic, historical fiction, and the silver fork novel.

4 Hideous progeny

The female philosopher in Gothic, historical and silver fork fiction

The future of the female philosopher

The female philosopher, both in her celebratory iteration as an avatar of Enlightenment, a representation of the potential of the thinking woman to enrich society, and in her counter-revolutionary version as nightmarish virago, contributes to competing ideas about what it means to be a feminist today. However, as Claudia L. Johnson argues, the tremendous influence that the figure of the female philosopher exerted on both the self-representations of women writers and their female characters in the early nineteenth century began to wane after 1815.¹ In this chapter, I map where the female philosopher ventures after her late appearances in Burney's *The Wanderer* and Austen's *Mansfield Park* by focusing on Mary Shelley's revitalisation of the figure in her Gothic, historical and silver fork fiction, comparing her work with that of other writers in these genres: in particular, Charlotte Dacre, Walter Scott and Catherine Gore. Shelley's engagement with the female philosopher across a series of different genres refashioned her for the new reading audiences of the 1820s and 1830s. In one sense, Shelley's closeness to Wollstonecraft – her close reading and personal involvement in her late mother's life and works – brings us back to the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century focus on Wollstonecraft's character and philosophy; in another sense, Shelley's distance – personal, philosophical and historical – from her mother's life and times leads to a more diffuse engagement with Wollstonecraft in these works. By examining Shelley's generic innovations in science fiction, the historical novel and silver fork fiction, alongside her development of the female philosopher figure in the 1820s and 1830s, this chapter traces the ripples of Wollstonecraft's influence on her daughter's and mid-nineteenth-century writing in sometimes surprising and disparate directions.

The 1820s and 1830s saw Europe torn between the contradictory impulses towards increased authoritarianism and widening participation in democracy. Revolutionary ideals of transnational cooperation disintegrated as authoritarian governments were reasserted across continental Europe accompanied by new models of diplomacy, as has been well discussed by Jonathan

1 Claudia L. Johnson, *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 21.

Sperber.² As Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes have shown, increasing demands for widening participation in democracy acted as a radical alternative to the reformation of autocratic regimes, culminating in Britain in the Great Reform Act of 1832.³ The rise of nationalism led to independence movements in Greece and Italy, as discussed in Roderick Beaton and David Ricks's collection on Greek nationalism and in Maria Schoina's discussion of the impact of Italian freedom movements on Shelley and her circle,⁴ and demands for patriotic compliance in Britain and elsewhere. Women in these decades saw a calcification of attitudes limiting their sphere of influence to the domestic realm.⁵ Shelley's experiments with fictional genres show her responding to the literary and cultural changes brought about by years of political turmoil. I argue that these generic innovations allow her to revivify Wollstonecraft's legacy in the nineteenth century.

Shelley's engagement with the Gothic genre has been widely discussed, in particular depth by Fred Botting and Anne Mellor, and in collections edited by Stephen Bann, and George Levine and U.C. Knoepfmacher.⁶ Ellen Moers' seminal essay on *Frankenstein* and the Female Gothic connects Shelley's novel to the Radcliffean tradition and argues that the novel engaged in a feminist critique of pregnancy, birth and afterbirth, Gothicising the Romantic idealisation of childhood; as Moers argues, 'What Mary Shelley actually did in *Frankenstein* was to transform the standard Romantic matter of incest, infanticide, and patricide into a phantasmagoria of the nursery'.⁷ Recent criticism has sought to complicate

- 2 Jonathan Sperber, *Revolutionary Europe, 1780–1850* (Harlow: Longman, 2000), 323–62. See also, *Napoleon's Legacy: The Problem of Government in Restoration Europe*, eds. David Laven and Lucy Riall (Oxford: Berg, 2000) on the resurgence of authoritarian governments across Europe.
- 3 See Arthur Burns and Joanna Innes, eds. *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780–1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), particularly their very useful introduction, 1–70.
- 4 *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism and the Uses of the Past*, eds. Roderick Beaton and David Ricks (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009) and Maria Schoina, *Romantic 'Anglo-Italians': Configurations of Identity in Byron, the Shelleys and the Pisan Circle* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009) analyse the impact of Greek and Italian freedom movements on Romantic writers, with Schoina exploring Mary Shelley's engagement in them.
- 5 *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850*, eds. Leonore Davidoff and Catherine Hall (London: Routledge, 2002) offers both a valuable survey of the wealth of literature on the 'separate spheres' discourse of nineteenth-century domesticity and a deconstruction of the term.
- 6 See Fred Botting, *Making Monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, Theory* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991), for a theoretical approach to *Frankenstein* and the Gothic, and Anne K. Mellor, *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fictions, Her Monsters* (London: Routledge, 1989), for a more historical approach. See also, Stephen Bann, ed. *Frankenstein, Creation and Monstrosity* (London: Reaktion, 1994) and George Levine and U.C. Knoepfmacher, eds. *The Endurance of Frankenstein: Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979).
- 7 Ellen Moers, 'The Female Gothic' in *The Endurance of Frankenstein: Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel*, eds. George Levine and Knoepfmacher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 77–87, 87.

the gendering of the genre, often using Charlotte Dacre's 1805 novel *Zofloya; or, the Moor* as a case which profoundly challenges the institution of the Female Gothic. By comparing *Frankenstein* to *Zofloya*, I argue that both Shelley and Dacre test the generic limits of the Gothic, play with gendered expectations, and probe anxieties about gender and genre. Shelley's use of the Gothic allows her to explore the figure of the female philosopher at a gendered remove, in the form of the male creature. She uses the creature's sense of alienation to analyse the psychic cost of social exclusion, expressed in strikingly similar ways to earlier female philosophers from Emma Courtney to Fanny Price.

Shelley's later, less discussed novels remodel the female philosopher figure of the 1790s and early nineteenth century within the new literary genres of the 1820s and 1830s. These genres include the historical novel, exemplified by Walter Scott's *Waverley* novels, and the silver fork novel, such as those written by Edward Bulwer-Lytton, Benjamin Disraeli and Catherine Gore. By engaging with Scott's historical fiction in her own historical novels *Valperga* and *Perkin Warbeck*, Shelley challenges Scott's division of femininity into reductive examples of passive and active, virtuous and dangerous women, and provides an imaginative genealogy for the female philosopher figure. Comparing Shelley's *Lodore*, an experiment with silver fork fiction, with one of Gore's novels, *Mrs Armytage; or, Female Domination*, shows both women testing the limits of female agency in the 1830s, focusing on the expression and control of transgressive female energies.

Throughout her writing career, Shelley engages with the personal, textual and intellectual legacy left to her by Mary Wollstonecraft, in order to explore how far competing representations of the female philosopher figure can be reformulated for her contemporary situation: from the male monster in *Frankenstein*, through the struggling female figures in *Valperga*, to the more successful heroines of *Perkin Warbeck* and *Lodore*.⁸ As I demonstrate in my discussion of *Frankenstein*, Shelley engages significantly with the female philosopher in her first novel, adapting the figure's social critique to the creature's feelings of despair and alienation. *Valperga* and *Perkin Warbeck* focus on the difficulties faced by women in patriarchal society, mapping the female philosopher onto different historical situations. Opportunities for improvement are shown to be dangerously fragile both in the past of Renaissance Italy and early Tudor Britain, although the later novel offers a delicately optimistic account of one woman's resilience and survival. A theme developing over the course of

8 Mary Shelley's novella *Matilda* (written in 1819 but suppressed by Godwin and published in 1959), her two travelogues, *History of a Six Weeks' Tour* (1817) and *Rambles through Germany and Italy* (1844), and her short stories all also bear traces of Wollstonecraft's influence, which calls for closer critical scrutiny. However, for the purposes of this chapter, a focus on Mary Shelley's Gothic, historical and silver fork novels reveals the trajectory of her engagement with Wollstonecraft, and how her approach to her mother's life and work matures over the course of two decades. I have also omitted discussion of *The Last Man* and *Falkner* mainly for reasons of space and argumentative focus.

these novels is the potential disruptiveness of women's agency, from Victor's fears about the power of the female creature in *Frankenstein*, leading him to destroy her, to Beatrice's powerful, seemingly prophetic voice in *Valperga*, which threatens to disrupt Euthanasia's more rational rule. In her early novels, Shelley's relationship with Wollstonecraft's life and writing is characterised by idealisation uneasily mixed with anxiety: she remains indebted to her mother's pioneering work on female education and women's potential in the public sphere, whilst voicing persistent doubts about the practicability of Wollstonecraft's theories in her own increasingly conservative, post-revolutionary world. Shelley's pragmatic concern with social reform aligns her with the earlier works by Opie, Hamilton and Edgeworth which I discuss in my second chapter. In her final novels, Shelley switches her focus to more positive models of female education in contrast to codes of honour which pervert male understanding. Both *Perkin Warbeck* and *Lodore* conclude with successful models of female behaviour. Moving beyond the deadly logic of her earlier novels, which see women as either passive victims or active agents in their own destruction, Shelley's later novels concentrate on women's survival strategies. Shelley adapts Wollstonecraft's arguments to her post-revolutionary situation, both building upon her mother's work and deliberately contrasting her own approach to Wollstonecraft's. This confident approach allows her to create powerful, successful female characters combining Wollstonecraft's rationalism with her own more Romantic worldview.

Contesting the Female Gothic: Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Dacre's *Zofloya*

In *Contesting the Gothic*, James Watt argues that the inclusion of the heterogeneous written material which described itself as 'Gothic' in the mid- to late eighteenth century destabilises twentieth-century attempts to construct a coherent Gothic canon. Conservative Gothic romances which drew upon an idealised medieval setting to celebrate chivalry, bravery and loyalty outnumber works with a subversive focus on the perversity of individual desire, which tend to garner undue attention within narratives of Gothic canonicity.⁹ Recent critical work has also sought to complicate understandings of gendered approaches to the Gothic, questioning the helpfulness of dividing the genre along Male and Female lines.¹⁰ A traditional approach to gender in the Gothic was to read Male

9 See James Watt, *Contesting the Gothic: Fiction, Genre and Cultural Conflict, 1764–1832* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Watt admits that, in contrast to the eighteenth-century Loyalist works he studies, 'many Gothic works written in the early nineteenth century were rhetorically richer and more complex, displaying a greater interest in formal innovation, a fascination with criminality or transgression, and a desire to complicate the romance schema of punishment and reward', including Shelley and Dacre's novels (111).

10 See, for example, *The Female Gothic: New Directions*, eds. Diana Wallace and Andrew Smith (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009). Angela Wright's 'Disturbing the Female Gothic: An Excavation of the *Northanger* Novels' in *Female Gothic: New*

Gothic as interested in the development, and often damnation, of a male hero-villain, whereas the Female Gothic views similar events from the perspective of an innocent female victim, resisting the hero-villain's violent advances. Even in Ellen Moers' seminal essay on the Female Gothic, this reductive equation, often based on a cursory reading of Ann Radcliffe's writing, has been questioned, with a focus on *Frankenstein's* trio of flawed male narrators negating a straightforward mapping of Shelley's work onto this Radcliffian schema. Moers instead argues that *Frankenstein* is profoundly concerned with the female experience of childbirth and its consequences. Charlotte Dacre occupies an increasingly significant position in arguments about the usefulness of the term Female Gothic, as her focus on violent women and the destructiveness of desire further complicates traditional narratives of female victimisation.

After being read as a controversial corollary to Lewis's *The Monk* for much of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, critical interest in Dacre's *Zofloya* has developed beyond this subordinating model since the publication of Adriana Craciun's 1997 Broadview edition. Craciun's paratextual apparatus argues for the novel's own importance beyond both Dacre's debt to Lewis and categorisations of *Zofloya* within the Female Gothic tradition, focusing on the violent sexualised subjectivity of the novel's heroine, Victoria de Loredani.¹¹ Critics have followed Craciun's pioneering work by exploring the themes of female violence in the novel and Dacre's innovative engagement with the Gothic genre. Building on Craciun's work, James A. Dunn explores the 'hermeneutics of violence' in Dacre's fiction, arguing that

it is coded positively in relation to sexual justice, as the murderous rages of her anti-heroines are lent no small degree of credence and legitimacy in the context of a larger gender injustice; and it is coded negatively in relation to the value of love, for Dacre's violent women always end tragically alone, cast out, spiteful, and often dead.¹²

This dialectic between justice and love is echoed in the tragic trajectory of the creature in Shelley's novel; his critique of Frankenstein's irresponsibility and

Directions, eds. Diana Wallace and Andrew Smith (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009), 66–75, is a particularly useful questioning of the Female Gothic in relation to Austen's engagement with Gothic fiction in *Northanger Abbey*. By reading several of the other 'Horrid Novels' mentioned in Austen's playful text, beyond Radcliffe's *The Mysteries of Udolpho*, Wright shows the limitations of a gendered view of the Gothic's complex representation of men, women, romance and marriage.

11 See Adriana Craciun, 'Introduction' to Charlotte Dacre, *Zofloya; or, the Moor*, ed. Adriana Craciun (Peterborough: Broadview, 1997), 9–32, in which she contextualises Dacre's treatment of sexuality in the novel by comparing her representation of Victoria with a contemporary tract on Nymphomania. See also her *Fatal Women of Romanticism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003) which devotes a chapter to Dacre's oeuvre, from her poetry to her novels, including *Zofloya*.

12 James A. Dunn, 'Charlotte Dacre and the Feminization of Violence' *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 53.3 (Dec., 1998): 307–27, 311.

social injustice is legitimated by his story, but his murderous actions leave him isolated and alienated at the end of the novel.

On Dacre's engagement with the Gothic, Carol Margaret Davison, contra Craciun, argues that *Zofloya* 'constitutes a strategically crafted and singular work of *complex* Female Gothic that speaks to its time by challenging various established views regarding women's nature and roles alongside the potentially explosive nature of the British colonial enterprise'.¹³ I find Davison's categorisation of *Zofloya* as a particularly complex form of Female Gothic more helpful than Craciun's gender-bending characterisation of Victoria as a male Gothic villain.¹⁴ Not only does Dacre choose to focus on a *female* Gothic villain, 'positioning her in the traditional hero-villain's role as a depraved, desiring subject [in order to] turn the established Female Gothic formula on its head' ('Getting Their Knickers in a Twist', 37), but she broadcasts her own authorial position as Gothically female in claiming to be 'Better Known as Rosa Matilda', riffing on Lewis's devilish femme fatale of the same name in *The Monk*, on *Zofloya*'s title page.¹⁵ Both Dacre and Shelley play with the conventions of Female Gothic, focusing on the transgressive violence which destabilises these established schemes. By comparing Shelley's *Frankenstein* with Dacre's *Zofloya*, in terms of their use of doubles to explore the duality of desire, I argue that both writers test the limits placed on female expression by foregrounding anxieties about power, anger and violence. For Shelley, especially, this violence reconfigures representations of the female philosopher and, through her, Mary Wollstonecraft.

The female philosopher seems, at first, to be absent from Shelley's first and most famous novel *Frankenstein*, as it is narrated by three male protagonists, and its female characters remain either marginalised or victimised by the action of the plot. However, both Ellen Moers and U.C. Knoepfelmacher have noted the creature's propinquity with the figure and, moreover, have focused on the way in which the creature's narrative accesses elements of Wollstonecraft's life and work above either Victor's counter-narrative or Walton's framing tale.¹⁶ Further, as Anne Mellor argues, Shelley forges a series of connections between the creature's story and the female characters in the novel, comparing his education, character and actions with those of Safie, who unconsciously aids his education and fearfully rejects him when he pleads for companionship with the

13 Carol Margaret Davison, 'Getting Their Knickers in a Twist: Contesting the "Female Gothic" in Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya*' *Gothic Studies* 11.1 (May, 2009): 32–45, 35. Original emphasis.

14 Craciun, 'Introduction', 11.

15 See my "'Better Known as Rosa Matilda": Charlotte Dacre's Authorial Doppelgänger' in *Women and Gothic*, ed. Maria Purves (Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014), 97–112, for a more detailed account of Dacre's use of her satanic pseudonym.

16 See U.C. Knoepfelmacher, 'Thoughts on the Aggression of Daughters' in *The Endurance of Frankenstein: Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel*, eds. George Levine and U.C. Knoepfelmacher (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979), 88–119, and Ellen Moers, 'The Female Gothic', 77–87.

De Lacey family, and Elizabeth Lavenza, whom he finally murders in warped revenge for Victor's destruction of the female creature.¹⁷ I argue that, by paralleling her depiction of the creature with representations of the female philosopher, together with allusions to Wollstonecraft's life and work, Shelley both creates sympathy for each of these figures – the creature, the female philosopher and Wollstonecraft – and reveals her anxieties about the destabilising qualities of all three.

The creature's narrative forms the central section of the novel, and many critics have focused on his story as the site of Shelley's engagement with the personal and textual legacy of Wollstonecraft's life and work. Charles Robinson and Joyce Zonana both argue that Shelley uses *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* to develop both the tale of Safie's escape from Oriental(ist) slavery and the creature's reasoned assault on Western values.¹⁸ Marie Mulvey-Roberts situates *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters*, in which Wollstonecraft positions the mother as the central figure in a child's development, as an important intertext connecting the creature's sense of alienation from the world with Shelley's own feelings of loss and betrayal at growing up without a mother.¹⁹ D.L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf further suggest that Shelley models the way in which the creature first learns to read on Wollstonecraft's 'Lessons', written for Fanny Imlay and first published in the *Posthumous Works*, as 'Both proceed from concrete to abstract, and both place learning in a supportive family context'.²⁰ I argue that these connections between Wollstonecraft's texts and the creature's (stunted) intellectual and emotional development also forge links between the creature and the representations of the female philosopher, both positive and negative, informed by Wollstonecraft's reputation in the early nineteenth century. The creature's autodidacticism, brought about by Frankenstein's abandonment of him, and his subsequent lack of the stable family environment sketched by Wollstonecraft in her 'Lessons', lead him to make similar critiques of the social hierarchy and hypocrisy disrupting his access to education to those asserted by the female philosopher figures of the 1790s, such as Mary Hays's Emma Courtney.

17 Anne Mellor connects the creature to Elizabeth and Safie in *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters*, further connecting him to Mary Shelley's self-representation as the novel's author, 45–7.

18 See Charles Robinson, 'A Mother's Daughter: An Intersection of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*' in *Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley: Writing Lives*, eds. Helen M. Buss et al. (Peterborough: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001), 127–38, and Joyce Zonana, '"They Will Prove the Truth of My Tale": Safie's Letters as the Feminist Core of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*', *Journal of Narrative Technique* 21.2 (Spring 1991): 170–84. Further references in-text as 'A Mother's Daughter' and 'Feminist Core' respectively.

19 See Marie Mulvey-Roberts, 'The Corpse in the Corpus: *Frankenstein*, Rewriting Wollstonecraft and the Abject' in *Mary Shelley's Fictions: From 'Frankenstein' to 'Falkner'*, eds. Michael Eberle-Sinatra and Nora Crook (Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000), 197–210.

20 See D.L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf, 'Introduction', *Frankenstein: The Original 1818 Text*, 2nd ed. (Peterborough: Broadview, 2005), 32.

The development of the creature's education depends on the arrival of Safie into the de Lacey household, which allows him to learn to read alongside her. Clemit argues that his progressive reading-matter, beginning with Volney's *Ruins* and moving on to Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*, Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and Goethe's *The Sorrows of Young Werther*, 'not only transforms the creature's sense of himself, but also equips him to launch a vigorous critique of Frankenstein's actions in both public and private spheres'.²¹ This transformative power of reading links him to female philosopher figures from the 1790s onwards. Like Emma Courtney, Maria, Adeline Mowbray, even Bridgetina Botherim, the creature's sense of personal and social injustice, and the eloquence of his attack on Victor's lack of parental responsibility, develops from his reading of philosophical and literary treatises. Shelley uses the creature's new sense of self to ironically criticise contemporary mores:

I learned that the possessions most esteemed by your fellow-creatures were, high and unsullied descent united with riches. A man might be respected with only one of these acquisitions; but without either he was considered, except in very rare instances, as a vagabond and a slave, doomed to waste his powers for the profit of the chosen few. And what was I? Of my creation and creator I was absolutely ignorant; but I knew that I possessed no money, no friends, no kind of property.

(*Frankenstein*, 89–90)

The creature's attack on the 'artificial distinctions of rank', campaigned against by Wollstonecraft in her *Vindication* (see Chapter 3), unites him to the reasoned critique of existing social structures by female philosopher figures from the 1790s, particularly Hays's Emma Courtney and Wollstonecraft's Maria. Shelley satirises existing class hierarchies through the creature's awareness that human beings value 'high and unsullied descent united with riches' at the expense of the 'virtue and good feelings' which the creature more genuinely admires in the De Lacey family.

The creature's reading of *Werther* and *Paradise Lost* mixes empathy (he identifies with Goethe's protagonist and with both Adam and Satan), with alienation: 'I found myself similar, yet at the same time strangely unlike the beings concerning whom I read, and to whose conversation I was a listener' (96). This detachment further links him to figures like Emma Courtney, whose early reading leads her to identify with both male and female heroes, until she realises that existing social structures both sexualise her and subordinate her desires to men's. The creature's confusion develops into existential crisis: 'My person was hideous, and my stature gigantic: what did this mean? Who was I? What was I? Whence did I come? What was my destination?' (96). Some of the

21 Pamela Clemit, 'Frankenstein, Matilda and the Legacies of Godwin and Wollstonecraft' in *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*, ed. Esther M. Schor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 26–44, 35.

answers are supplied to him through Victor's diary of the events leading up to his creation, which he finds in his clothes and returns to his creator. He describes his discovery of the details of his 'accursed origin': 'the whole detail of that series of disgusting circumstances which produced it is set in view; the minutest description of my odious and loathsome person is given, in language which painted your own horrors, and rendered mine ineffaceable', leading him to curse his creator for leaving him ugly, alone and hated (97). The creature's highly charged language, 'accursed', 'disgusting', 'odious and loathsome', does more than simply reflect his 'ineffaceable' self-loathing; it also highlights the transgressive nature of Victor's actions.

The creature's return of Victor's journal develops the recurring theme of the circulation of manuscripts in *Frankenstein*. Earlier, the creature offers Victor his transcripts of the letters between Felix and Safie which he claims 'will prove the truth of my tale' (92), by providing external evidence of the De Lacey family (although the strength of this evidence is diluted by their status as copies). Later used as evidence for the truth of Victor's tale by passing them on to Walton, the contents of these letters are only summarised by the creature, never transcribed for the actual reader of the novel. The creature's narration of the content of these letters centres on the development of Safie's moral sense, which parallels Wollstonecraft's arguments on this process of maturation in the *Vindication*, stressing independence, intellectual development and moral rectitude. Zonana reads 'the letters as central ... in finding the "mother", Mary Wollstonecraft, at the heart of Shelley's text ... taking Mary Wollstonecraft's presence to have literary and philosophical rather than psychological and personal meaning' ('Feminist Core', 171). Robinson questions Safie's status as Wollstonecraftian heroine, arguing that it is problematised by her climactic rejection of the creature. I argue that Safie's treatment of the creature, reacting to his plea for companionship with fear and horror, reveals the complexity of Shelley's vision, showing her despairing insight into the lack of solidarity amongst alienated groups.

Safie's mother 'was a Christian Arab, seized and made a slave by the Turks' (92). Her determination to instruct her daughter 'in the tenets of her religion, and ... to aspire to higher powers of intellect, and an independence of spirit, forbidden to the female followers of Mahomet' (92) links both Safie and her mother not only to Wollstonecraft's feminism but to the connections she makes between women's position in patriarchal society and slavery throughout the *Vindication*.²² Zonana argues that 'Safie's story, an embodiment of Wollstonecraft's philosophy, is equivalent to the monster's story ... The plot

22 Moira Ferguson analyses Wollstonecraft's abolitionist stance in *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman in Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670–1834* (London: Routledge, 1992), arguing that Wollstonecraft is 'the first white British woman to mount a twin-pronged philosophical and economic assault on the institution [of slavery]', 188. Shelley's comparison of Safie and her mother with 'the female followers of Mahomet' also echoes Wollstonecraft's critique of Islam, in which she mistakenly argues that the religion denies that women can have a soul.

contained in the letters ... can prove nothing about the monster's tale. But the theme, communicated through characterisation and imagery that evoke the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*, is deeply relevant to the monster's story', as both Safie and the creature rebel against circumstances enforced upon them by patriarchy ('Feminist Core', 174). Safie refuses to consent to a life in the harem and the creature revolts against the solitary existence brought about because of Victor's abnegation of responsibility. Robinson focuses on Safie's failure to sympathise with the creature, when she runs away from his plea for friendship, arguing that 'Despite all of her admirable qualities, Safie redeemed neither the monster nor the text of this novel' ('A Mother's Daughter', 136). Robinson's desire that Safie and the creature unite in solidarity in order to somehow redeem the novel misses Shelley's more sophisticated perspective on the lack of connection between alienated individuals in modern society. In the end, the creature is left with a painful sense of social exclusion, shared by Wollstonecraft and Shelley, which leads him to violence and (self-)destruction.

The creature's narrative ends with his demand that Victor make him a female companion because 'I am alone, and miserable; man will not associate with me; but one as deformed and horrible as myself would not deny herself to me' (*Frankenstein*, 107). Persuaded by the creature's sympathetic, rational speech, Victor finally agrees to make him a female companion, although he is already concerned that their 'joint wickedness might desolate the earth' (108). Victor eventually destroys his second creature in front of his first. He argues first that 'she might be ten thousand times more malignant than her mate, and delight, for its own sake in murder and wretchedness' (128), secondly, that she 'might refuse to comply with a compact [to quit Europe with the male creature] made before her creation', thirdly that the creatures 'might even hate each other' because of their mutual hideousness, and finally, that, through their sexual union, 'a race of devils would be propagated upon the earth, who might make the very existence of the species of man a condition precarious and full of terror' (128). Anne Mellor contends that Victor's arguments explicitly reveal his fear of female sexuality, implicit in his attempt to create offspring on his own.²³ Further, the gender of the female creature would actualise the implied connections between the first creature, Wollstonecraft and the female philosopher figure, creating a link between femininity, philosophy and revolution which remains occluded in the relationship between the creature and Victor. Shelley herself had laboured to obfuscate these connections by making the creature male rather than female, enabling her to explore the legacy of the female philosopher's political and cultural critiques, and, by extension, those of Wollstonecraft herself, from a more neutral, or masculine, perspective. Shelley makes Victor's extreme fear of the malignity of the female creature, that she might become 'ten thousand times' worse than her mate, indulging in violence 'for its own sake' (which revealingly acknowledges the legitimacy of the first creature's actions), mirror contemporary fears, about the socio-political, economic and cultural costs of increased female

23 Anne Mellor, *Mary Shelley*, 40.

agency, nowhere more explicit than in the reactionary attacks on Wollstonecraft's legacy after her death.

Both Shelley and Dacre set up a series of doubles which reflect upon each other in *Frankenstein* and *Zofloya*: Dacre mirrors the tragic trajectory of her anti-heroine Victoria in the parallel fates of her adulterous mother, Laurina; in the scheming, vengeful Megalena Strozzi who ensnares Victoria's brother, Leonardo; in the contrastingly innocent, pure, pale Lilla who casts the guilty, perverse, ever darkening Victoria into shadow; and in Zofloya himself, the eponymous, Satanic/Moorish servant who becomes her partner in crime before engaging his mistress in an infernal mockery of marriage. In *Frankenstein*, the relationships between Walton, Victor and the creature, which focus on ambition and defeat, friendship and enmity, responsibility and its dereliction, are complicated by each character's connections to the women in the novel – Margaret Saville, Elizabeth Lavenza, Safie de Lacey. The creature's killing of Elizabeth and alienating connection to the Christian Arab Safie echoes Victoria's murder of Lilla and her complex relationship with the Satanic Moor Zofloya.²⁴

The innocent orphan Lilla offers a purified relection of Victoria as her rival for Henriquez's affections, and she is described by Dacre in ways which deliberately contrast her with Victoria. Lilla is:

Pure, innocent, free even from the smallest taint of a corrupt thought ... delicate, symmetrical, and of fairy-like beauty, her person so small, yet of so just proportion; sweet, expressing a seraphic serenity of soul, seemed her angelic countenance, slightly suffused with the palest hue of the virgin rose.
(*Zofloya*, 144)

Whilst emphasising Lilla's beautiful purity, the hissing sibilance of the last lines align themselves with Victoria's active dislike of Lilla. Stating that Lilla's situation as an orphan 'had a powerful claim upon the heart of sensibility', Dacre traces Victoria's opposite, violent response: 'The most wild and horrible ideas took possession of her brain; crimes of the deepest dye her imagination could conceive appeared as nothing, opposed to the possibility of obtaining a return of love from Henriquez' (144). This 'furor' leads her to plot Lilla's abduction and murder – an event which both coincides with the novel's conventional moral framework and plays havoc with it. Craciun argues that the

value of her *femmes fatales* lies in the dialectical relationship they have with their 'innocent' victims ... for Dacre ultimately makes these asexual martyrs as repugnant and inhuman as their destroyers ... The true subversive potential

24 Dacre's *Zofloya*, along with Lewis's *The Monk*, inspired Percy Bysshe Shelley's own juvenile Gothic novel, *Zastrozzi*. Dacre's novel could then be an indirect inspiration for Mary Shelley's later masterpiece, channelling the former's transgressive violence into the relationship between Victor and his creature in *Frankenstein*.

of Dacre's female characters lies thus in their mutual annihilation, and in the pleasure [her *femmes fatales*] find in this destruction.²⁵

Building on Craciun, Dunn reads a further dialectic in the way 'Dacre uses the concept of violence to conflate the presumptive binary opposition of "masculine" and "feminine"', although he concludes that 'its liberating potential [is] never fully able to pull away from tragic consequences' ('Feminization of Violence', 310–11). Shelley, too, focuses on the tragic consequences of the encounters between connected figures: the creature is shunned by Safie and kills Elizabeth – there can be no solidarity between alienated figures in Shelley's pessimistic worldview.

Victoria's murder of Lilla is narrated with a breathless, exclamatory sense of excitement. Throughout the tumultuous passage describing Victoria's final confrontation with her rival, Dacre contrasts Lilla's passive, suffering beauty with Victoria's gloomy rage and frantic madness, laying Gothic emphasis on Victoria's penetrative violence and Lilla's gory wounds. Although the scantily clad and scarcely fed Lilla has been imprisoned in a lonely cave, Dacre stresses her miraculously preserved beauty, stating that compared to her 'gloomy persecutor' she still appears 'in figure, grace, and attitude, a miniature semblance of the Medicean Venus' (*Zofloya*, 218). As Craciun and others have noted, Lilla resembles De Sade's victim Justine in the continuance of her beauty amidst intense suffering. Lilla and Victoria's exclamatory conversation continues to contrast the two figures, most pertinently after Victoria informs Lilla of Henriquez's suicide. Lilla whimpers: 'Dead! – Ah, cruel Victoria! murdered by thee?' To which Victoria 'fiercely returned': 'Murdered by *thee*, viper! ... 'Twas thee who plunged the sword in his breast, – thy accursed image revelling there, impelled him to the frantic deed!' (219, original emphasis). Victoria herself stresses the connections between the two when she reformulates Lilla's distressed question to implicate her innocent rival in her violent passion.

Lilla's murder functions as the climax of Victoria's reign of terror as it places her under the command of Zofloya. After Victoria kills Lilla, Dacre represents Zofloya as implicitly and, increasingly, explicitly Satanic, revealing his knowledge of Victoria's private acts and threatening to reveal her murderous deeds and leave her to the inquisition unless she subordinates herself to his will. Zofloya is also the final, and I argue, most important of Victoria's doubles in the novel, and further acts as a mouthpiece for the narrative voice's unconventional morality. Like Matilda's perverse romance with Ambrosio in Lewis's *The Monk*, Zofloya's relationship with Victoria undergoes a series of unsettling shifts over the course of Dacre's novel. Lewis's focus shifts from the latent homoeroticism of Rosario's love for the Monk to Matilda embodying his dark, psychic urges to her mimicry of the positions of mistress, wife and scold, before revealing her demonic self. Zofloya's partnership with Victoria similarly modulates from a subservient position to one of profane, perverse mastery, flirting with contemporary fears of miscegenation by depicting an implicitly sexualised relationship between a white noblewoman and a black manservant. He could also be read as the

25 Craciun, 'Introduction', 28.

embodiment of her violent sensuality, with the dominance he asserts over her at the end of the novel signifying the triumph of Victoria's id. Victoria and Zofloya's relationship mirrors the shifting power dynamic between Frankenstein and his creature. Victor views his creature as demonic, unwilling to accept his own dereliction of duty as partially responsible for the creature's crimes. The creature also functions as a monstrous projection of Victor's desires, eventually asserting as powerful a control over his creator as Zofloya does over Victoria.

As I have suggested, Zofloya also functions as the novel's subversive moral arbiter. Throughout the novel, Zofloya both tempts Victoria into further acts of wickedness and cautions her about the costs of her behaviour. These italicised, didactic warnings, consistently misread by Victoria herself, offer the most conventional moralisations in the novel to the reader, reflecting the complex ethical framework of the novel by placing orthodox ethical teachings in the mouth of the devil himself. Unlike the De Loredani children who blame their own sins on the transgressions of their mother, inconsistently backed up by Dacre's narratorial voice, Zofloya always stresses Victoria's active responsibility for her crimes. Zofloya enters the narrative through his appearance in Victoria's darkly wish-fulfilling dreams, which foresee the destruction of Berenza and Lilla at her and Henriquez's wedding ceremony, only to foreshadow the suicide of Henriquez when Victoria takes Lilla's place at the altar. After Zofloya's disappearance, reported death and mysterious reappearance bring him into contact with Victoria in reality, he uses the language of gallantry to flatter Victoria and insinuate his ability to answer her wishes. Throughout their encounters, Zofloya's statements equivocate between the language of chivalry and that of damnation. For example, after he suggests poisoning Berenza, he both flatters Victoria and reveals his dependence on her active desire for evil when he tells her: '*Zofloya must fly you in despair, should you disdain his proffered services*' (163, original emphasis). Reiterating this double-edged point later in the novel, he tells Victoria:

Your fate, your fortune, fair Signora, will be of your own making: I am but the humble tool, the slave of your wishes; your co-operation with me alone can render me powerful; but fly me, disdain my assistance, and despise my friendship I *sink abashed into myself, and am powerless!*

(168, original emphasis)

Victoria naively reads these statements as an indication of her Moorish servant's subservience. Read in the hindsight of Zofloya's revelation that he is really the devil, heavily hinted at throughout, these statements offer a not-so-coded indication of the limits of Satanic influence and of Victoria's ethical responsibility for her actions.

By emphasising Victoria's ethical responsibility for her actions, Zofloya offers a more consistent moral than that provided by the narrative voice at the conclusion to the novel:

Reader – consider not this as a romance only. – Over their passions and their weaknesses, mortals cannot keep a curb too strong. The progress of

vice is gradual and imperceptible, and the arch enemy ever waits to take advantage of the failings of mankind, whose destruction is his glory! That his seductions may prevail, we dare not doubt; for can we otherwise account for those crimes, dreadful and repugnant to nature, which human beings are sometimes tempted to commit? Either we must suppose that the love of evil is born with us (which would be an insult to the Deity) or we must attribute them (as appears more consonant to reason) to the suggestions of infernal influence.

(254–5)

Often read straight as a disappointingly conventional moral which fails to account for the subversive energy of the text, this coda is in fact infused with Dacrian irony. The syntax of the sentence ‘Over their passions and their weaknesses, mortals cannot keep a curb too strong’ works against the ostensible moral. It seems to say ‘mortals must strongly curb their passions and weaknesses’ at the same time as the structure of it suggests the reading ‘mortals cannot curb their passions and weaknesses’. The narrator has also traced the progression of Victoria’s vice with gory enthusiasm, belying the sense that its development is ‘imperceptible’ in individuals. The novel offers a different answer to the question ‘can we otherwise account for those crimes’ than the binary adduced in this conclusion between original sin and ‘infernal influence’: by clearly setting out the limitations on his ‘infernal influence’, Satan suggests that individuals hold the ultimate ethical responsibility over their salvation or damnation.

Unlike Victoria in *Zofloya* (or, indeed, Victor in *Frankenstein*), the creature returns at the conclusion of Shelley’s novel to take responsibility for his terrible actions. Confronted by his dead creator, and the execrations of Walton, Frankenstein’s creature agrees: ‘But it is true that I am a wretch. I have murdered the lovely and the helpless ... You hate me; but your abhorrence cannot equal that with which I regard myself’ (*Frankenstein*, 243). However, he eloquently connects his evil to social ills:

Am I to be thought the only criminal, when all human kind sinned against me? Why do you not hate Felix, who drove his friend from his door with contumely? Why do you not execrate the rustic who sought to destroy the saviour of his child? Nay, these are virtuous and immaculate beings! I, the miserable and the abandoned, am an abortion, to be spurned at, and kicked, and trampled on. Even now my blood boils at the recollection of this injustice.

(243)

The creature’s self-recrimination shows him to have exceeded the limited ethical understanding of his creator, Frankenstein; by connecting his evil actions to social injustice, he eloquently protests the effects of his alienation and loneliness.

Historicising the Female Philosopher: *Valperga*, *Perkin Warbeck*, and Walter Scott

After *Frankenstein*, Mary Shelley experimented with different types of writing throughout her career: *Matilda*, a novella dealing frankly with incest, censored until the twentieth century; *Lodore*, a silver fork novel (discussed below); the science fiction of *The Last Man*; and two historical novels, *Valperga; or, the Life and Adventures of Castruccio, Prince of Lucca* (1823) and *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck* (1830). Both novels engage in a dialogue with Walter Scott's historical novels; the authorship of the anonymous Waverley novels being an open secret by the 1820s. Lidia Garbin argues that Shelley's 'love of Scott is shown by her reading *Ivanhoe*, *Waverley*, *The Antiquary* and *Rob Roy* in the space of a week, from 12 to 20 December 1821'.²⁶ Deidre Lynch contrasts *Valperga* with Scott's fiction, arguing that Shelley consciously reformulates the gender politics of the Waverley novels in her own writing.²⁷ Judith Wilt attacks Scott's treatment of women in his fiction, contending that his privileging of women's private influence over real power in the public sphere of political action constitutes the 'Great Lie' in his writing, as it ensnares women in a discourse of passive domesticity.²⁸ I argue that Shelley uses the space which Scott's Waverley novels open up for thinking about historical contingency and legitimacy to cast the female philosopher back in time, which both creates an imaginative genealogy for the figure and experiments with different possibilities for the expression of female agency.

I situate Scott's female heroines as contrasting echoes of the female philosopher to Shelley's representation of historicised female philosophers in *Valperga* and *Perkin Warbeck*. Alexander Welsh argues that:

The proper heroine of Scott is a blonde. Her role corresponds to that of the passive hero – whom, indeed, she marries at the end. She is eminently beautiful, and eminently prudent. Like the passive hero, she suffers in the thick of events but seldom moves them. The several dark heroines, no less beautiful, are less restrained from the pressure of their own feelings ... They allow their feelings to dictate to their reason, and seem to symbolize passion itself.²⁹

26 Lidia Garbin, 'The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck: Walter Scott in the Writings of Mary Shelley' *Romanticism on the Net* 6 (May 1997) <<http://www.erudit.org/revue/RON/1997/v/n6/005752ar.html>> 5 September 2012.

27 Deidre Lynch, 'Historical Novelist' in *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*, ed. Esther M. Schor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 135–50.

28 Judith Wilt, *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985) 116–17. Wilt specifically attacks Scott's heroine in *The Heart of Mid-Lothian*, Jeanie Deans, arguing that her inability to trade the villainous Sir George Staunton's life for her half-sister Effie's, and her later release of this unlucky couple's illegitimate son, constitutes 'the crucial topos of this novel ... that women must save, may not kill man', 126. I suggest that Scott's treatment of Jeanie is more complex than Wilt allows, especially her concluding release of the parricide son.

29 Alexander Welsh, *The Hero of the Waverley Novels* (Yale University Press, 1963), 71.

Viewed in this way, Scott's contrasting heroines, I contend, contain echoes of the conflicting iterations of the female philosopher figure in the 1790s and later. For example, the proper, passive Rose Bradwardine in *Waverley* resembles the 'safe' Enlightenment version of the figure, exemplified by Edgeworth's Belinda or even Austen's Fanny Price, whereas Flora MacIvor's rebellious, Jacobite energy draws on the counter-revolutionary representation of the dangerously sexy, Jacobin female philosopher. Other *Waverley* novels also seem to draw on female philosopher figures, for example, Julia Mannering, caught between duty to her eponymous father, Guy Mannering, and desire for the lost laird of Ellangowan, Harry Bertram, in Scott's own second novel of 1815, and Diana Vernon, the fiery, Jacobite love interest of Frank Osbaldistone in *Rob Roy* (1817). Both of these women flirt with criticisms of social and familial strictures on female education and expression, played for mostly comic effect in *Guy Mannering* but with explicitly revolutionary, and potentially tragic, ramifications in *Rob Roy*, before they settle down with the heroes of their respective novels. Especially in her early novels, Shelley challenges the restriction on women's influence to the private sphere, offering a political, active alternative in Euthanasia's rule in *Valperga* before the more nuanced critique of *Perkin Warbeck*.

Valperga, Shelley's second full-length novel, contrasts the historical ascent of the titular Castruccio Castracani, the early Renaissance Italian soldier turned despot, celebrated by Machiavelli, with the fictional fortunes of two women, the liberal, republican ruler Euthanasia and the would-be prophet Beatrice, whose fates are intimately connected to Castruccio's ruthless rise to power. Euthanasia represents an alternative to Castruccio's autocratic regime: Shelley imagines *Valperga* as a liberal, enlightened state championing social stability, a politics of care and cultural richness. Although Castruccio eventually betrays Euthanasia, razing *Valperga* to the ground, she embodies Shelley's ideal of female agency and political reform. In Euthanasia, she superimposes the Enlightenment iteration of the female philosopher figure, together with elements of Percy Bysshe Shelley and Wollstonecraft's political arguments, onto the context of fourteenth-century Italy, suggesting new possibilities for the novel's contemporary context, especially the Italian independence movement gathering pace in the 1820s. The early 1820s saw the development of the Italian unification movement, *il Risorgimento* (meaning, the Resurgence), which began in 1815, after the fall of Napoleon and the reorganisation of Italy as a conglomeration of independent city states under Austrian rule. There were minor insurrections in Sicily in 1820 and Piedmont in 1821 which failed to win widespread support, but, more importantly, a cultural and artistic movement advocating national independence began to gather force.³⁰ Shelley lived and worked in Italy during this period, and *Valperga* can be read, in part, as her imagined manifesto for a liberal, republican government, exemplified by Euthanasia's enlightened rule.

30 See Derek Beales and Eugenio Biagini, *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy* (1971; repr. Harlow: Longman, 2002) for a detailed discussion of the Italian independence movement over the course of the nineteenth century.

As Euthanasia's fate reveals Castruccio's destructiveness in the public sphere, witnessing her childhood friendship with the despot sacrificed to political expediency, his corruption of Beatrice underscores his private vices. Castruccio seduces then discards Beatrice, both fascinated by her powerful status as seeming seer and repelled by this example of her disturbing agency. Shelley's representation of Beatrice draws on counter-revolutionary depictions of the female philosopher, combining potentially revolutionary public power with destabilising sensuality, but places her in a historical context distinct from that of either the 1790s or 1820s. Beatrice both parallels and contrasts with Euthanasia: Beatrice's uncritical devotion to the man who has effectively ruined her highlights Euthanasia's moral stance against Castruccio, at the same time as revealing how her feelings for the devious Prince blind her to the perfidy of his actions. Other accounts of the novel have noticed the mirrored relationship between Euthanasia and Beatrice.³¹ However, by connecting them to the contrasting figures of the female philosopher in novels by Elizabeth Hamilton, Maria Edgeworth, Frances Burney and Jane Austen, I stress the contemporary significance of these imagined historical figures: Shelley uses Euthanasia and Beatrice to comment on nineteenth-century debates about Italian independence, nationalism, and the fate of the female philosopher in these discussions.

Like Opie's *Adeline Mowbray* and Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers*, *Valperga* concludes with the deaths of its heroines, Euthanasia and Beatrice. However, whereas Beatrice represents a provocative extension back into history of the female philosopher's self-destructive desires, the contrasting character Euthanasia suggests new possibilities for female agency, at the same time as the exigencies of her historical situation conspire against her reformist politics. Shelley's representations of the parallel personalities of her two heroines, together with the development of their relationship in the later stages of the novel, engages with the emerging tradition of contrasting female philosopher figures in novels by Hamilton, Edgeworth, Burney and Austen (discussed in previous chapters), positioning competing images of the female philosopher in a different historical context, early Renaissance Italy. In the figures of Euthanasia and Beatrice, *Valperga* historicises the female philosopher, creating an imaginary genealogy for a figure who haunts early nineteenth-century women's writing, particularly in the representation and reception of Wollstonecraft's political and philosophical thought, providing a historical justification for Shelley's feminism.

Euthanasia's personality and politics connect her across historical boundaries to the Enlightenment female philosopher figure, in terms of her education, her personal stance on political issues surrounding liberty, republicanism and female agency, and her religious devotion. By the 1820s, the female philosopher as Enlightenment avatar was inextricably intertwined, for good or ill, with early 1790s revolutionary discourse and the posthumous reputation of Wollstonecraft. Euthanasia therefore represents Shelley's engagement with her mother

31 See, for example, Betty T. Bennett, *Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley: An Introduction* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998).

Wollstonecraft's revolutionary politics: she positions Euthanasia as an enlightened female ruler, embodying the possibilities for women's political agency which are mentioned but left undeveloped in Wollstonecraft's *Vindication*, for example, her 'hint' that she 'really think[s] that women ought to have [political] representatives, instead of being arbitrarily governed without having any direct share allowed them in the deliberations of government' (217). Euthanasia represents one of these representatives, cast back in time.

Euthanasia receives an anachronistically enlightened education, generally unavailable to women in Renaissance Florence, due to her father's blindness, which means his studies require her help. She offers to aid his studies by learning Latin, not the 'rude and barbarous Latin' of fourteenth-century Italy but 'the polished language of Cicero and Virgil'.³² Shelley describes the effects of her 'advantageous and memorable' education:

she did not acquire that narrow idea of the present times, as if they and the world were the same, which characterizes the unlearned; she saw and marked the revolutions that had been, and the present seemed to her only a point of rest, from which time was to renew his flight, scattering changes as he went; and, if her voice or act could mingle aught of good in these changes, this it was to which her imagination most ardently aspired. She was deeply penetrated by the acts and thoughts of those men, who despised the spirit of party, and grasped the universe in the hopes of virtue and independence.

(*Valperga*, 18)

This passage celebrates Euthanasia's reformist vision of futurity in a way which chimes with the writings of Wollstonecraft, Godwin and Percy Shelley. Her rejection of 'the spirit of party' reflects Shelley's post-revolutionary sensibility: her representation of the mutually destructive squabbles of the Guelphs and Ghibelines reflects her awareness that neither the radicalism of her parents' 1790s generation nor the deepening conservatism of the 1820s offers her the 'hopes of virtue and independence' which animate her heroine in the novel. Her conclusion that Euthanasia's 'young thoughts darted into futurity, to the hope of freedom for Italy, of revived learning and the reign of peace for all the world' were 'wild dreams' represents a challenge to a post-revolutionary era resigned to the re-establishment of partisan politics and autocratic regimes, connecting her historical novel with contemporary liberation movements in Italy and Greece.

Describing Euthanasia and Castruccio's developing love for each other, Shelley links Euthanasia to late eighteenth-century female philosophers, such as

32 Mary Shelley, *Valperga; or, The Life and Adventures of Castruccio, Prince of Lucca* (1823) ed. Nora Crook *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 3. (London: Pickering & Chatto, 1996), 18. Subsequent references, in-text.

Emma Courtney in Hays's novel and Maria in Wollstonecraft's unfinished work, by showing how her idealisation of Castruccio blinds her to his flawed moral character. She gives this trope an explicitly political twist, by revealing that Euthanasia's love of liberty, which has matured into a complex cultural system, is incompatible with Castruccio's narrower power-based policy. Shelley informs her readers: 'Castruccio was a staunch Ghibeline, and his soul was set on the advancement of that party; he did not sympathize with Euthanasia, but he appeared to do so, for he loved her, and listened, his eyes shining with pleasure, while she spoke in silver tones, and all appeared wise and good that came from her lips' (78). By playing Castruccio's lack of sympathy for Euthanasia's ideals against his desire for her, Shelley suggests both characters' limited appreciation of the abilities of the other. Although Euthanasia is able, by the end of the novel, to recognise and rebuke Castruccio's self-serving arguments, her innocent love for him fatally delays this realisation. Shelley refuses to allow Castruccio any such moment of tragic self-recognition, instead showing how his political ambitions destroy his private virtues.

Shelley traces the tensions between Euthanasia's love for Castruccio and duty towards her dependents, contrasting her principled stance against his unscrupulous actions, culminating in his attack on Valperga by way of a little-known weak point used whilst he was courting Euthanasia. Before he attempts this ambush he sends his trusted lieutenant, and Euthanasia's friend, Arrigo di Guinigi, to persuade her to cede Valperga willingly to him. Arrigo's message from Castruccio mimics terms used by Euthanasia when she attempted to explain that her official duties trumped her love for him, so he argues that his threatened attack on Valperga is 'a question of state, and not a private altercation; and he would be unworthy of the trust reposed in him, if he permitted his individual inclinations to interfere with his duty towards the public' (201). Euthanasia sees through Castruccio's rhetoric and replies:

I would that the prince had not so far degraded himself, as to veil his tyranny with hypocrisy and falsehood ... I will never willingly surrender my power into his hands: I hold it for the good of my people, who are happy under my government, and towards whom I shall ever perform my duty. I look upon him as a lawless tyrant, whom every one ought to resist to the utmost of their power; nor will I through cowardice give way to injustice.

(201)

Euthanasia's response tears the veil away from Castruccio's sophistry and reveals his underlying corrupting ambition, stressing the continuity between Castruccio's private motivations and his actions in the public sphere. Her eloquence – in positioning his attack as a personally motivated assault rather than a public action; in standing up for the good of her people against his wishes; and in underscoring the principles of her resistance to his lawless tyranny – also reveals the extent to which Euthanasia functions as Shelley's

ideal of a female ruler. Euthanasia draws on both the political ideals of Shelley's husband, Percy Bysshe, with Tilottama Rajan describing her as 'androgynously Shelleyan',³³ and her mother, Wollstonecraft, as Stuart Curran argues that 'On the profoundest level, Euthanasia dei Adimari represents the ideal to which Mary Wollstonecraft subscribed throughout her writings, and particularly in the *Vindication of the Rights of Woman*'.³⁴ By combining Wollstonecraft's dream of female political leadership of the 1790s with Shelley's later arguments for enlightened rule, Shelley creates a powerful avatar of female philosopher as politician in Euthanasia, creating a space for this very contemporary figure in an imagined past.

Castruccio destroys Valperga and coerces Euthanasia into remaining his guest/prisoner at Lucca. When she is entrapped in a conspiracy against his life, Castruccio is unable to execute his childhood lover, instead banishing Euthanasia over the waves. Her ship is caught in a storm and she is never seen again, forgotten from public history. In her conclusion, Shelley contrasts the 'private chronicles' which recount the life and death of Euthanasia with the 'public histories ... of the last years of the life of Castruccio' (323). In this way, she points to contemporary conceptions of the private sphere, more and more designated female, compared to the public sphere of male, political action, whilst at the same time problematising such divisiveness: Euthanasia has acted in a principled, enlightened manner in the public sphere, whilst Castruccio has abused his power in both public and private. She also uses the private/public debate to differentiate her use of the genre of the historical novel from Walter Scott by focusing on the ways in which women could act and effect change, as well as the social, cultural and political obstacles placed on such action; a perspective generally absent from Scott's fiction. Shelley's focus on the private chronicles from which she has reanimated Euthanasia allows her to encode in this downbeat conclusion the possibility of liberal, enlightened government by a woman. The wistful concluding lines of Euthanasia's story, 'Earth felt no change when she died; and men forgot her' (322), further suggests a link to Wollstonecraft, who Shelley may feel has similarly been forgotten: her novel reanimates not only Euthanasia, but, through her, the ghost of Wollstonecraft.

Throughout *Valperga*, Shelley contrasts Euthanasia's reasoned stance towards her trials and misfortunes against Beatrice's superstitious upbringing and increasingly irrational behaviour. Beatrice is introduced at the beginning of Volume II as a prophetess, suspected by the Inquisition and aided, albeit unknowingly, by corrupt priests to defeat their trial of her as a witch. She falls in love with Castruccio, who has sex with her, before revealing that he is in fact in love with Euthanasia, leaving her a broken woman. Although given a

33 Tilottama Rajan, 'Between Romance and History: Possibility and Contingency in Godwin, Leibniz, and Mary Shelley's *Valperga*', in *Mary Shelley in Her Times*, eds. Betty Bennett and Stuart Curran (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000), 88–102, 88–9.

34 Stuart Curran, 'Valperga' in *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*, ed. Esther Schor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 103–15, 113.

Renaissance veneer, Beatrice's career resembles that of female philosopher figures celebrated in early revolutionary writing and satirised in Anti-Jacobin fiction: Shelley replaces the destabilising political radicalism of the female philosopher with Beatrice's religious fanaticism, but from this different starting point allows Beatrice to give voice to social criticisms she shares with more contemporary feminist figures.

Shelley's depiction of Beatrice as a female philosopher further distinguishes itself from contemporary representations, often set in the immediate aftermath of the French Revolution, in her lack of a satirical narrative voice; Beatrice's own narrative of her life and love is treated seriously and sympathetically. Shelley's exchange of the female philosopher's revolutionary fervour with Beatrice's religious fanaticism clearly marks the fallacy of Beatrice's beliefs (her vocation as prophetess is revealed to be a sham and leads to her terrible, Gothic demise, maddened by the pronouncements of a false witch to throw herself under Castruccio's horse), at the same time as allowing her powerful expression of both her desires and her critique of a social system which validates male desire at the expense of female. Instead of falling back in line with social values as was customary with contemporary female philosophers, Beatrice is allowed to enunciate a wide-ranging critique of social ills, still prevalent in Shelley's time, in her confrontation with Euthanasia. First, Beatrice attacks Euthanasia's belief in a benevolent deity, arguing 'with tumultuous eloquence': 'you either worship a useless shadow, or a fiend in the clothing of a god' (242). She demands: 'Look around you. Is there not war, violation of treaties, and hard-hearted cruelty? Look at the societies of men; are not our fellow creatures tormented one by the other in an endless circle of pain?' (243). She then lists public, religious and military atrocities of the recent Italian past, before turning to the private sphere: 'Then reflect upon domestic life, on the strife, hatred and uncharitableness, that, as sharp spears, pierce one's bosom at every turn; think of jealousy, midnight murders, envy, want of faith, calumny, ingratitude, cruelty, and all which man in his daily sport inflicts upon man' (243). She finally turns to the intellectual and emotional composition of the individual human being, castigating God's contrariness: 'Oh, what spirit mingled in my wretched frame love, hope, energy, confidence, – to find indifference, to be blasted with despair, to be as weak as the fallen leaf, to be betrayed by all!' (243–4). She concludes by voicing a profound ambivalence about the imagination itself, in a lengthy diatribe which expresses searching concerns about a central tenet of not only Percy Shelley's philosophy, but the educational systems of Godwin and Wollstonecraft as well:

And the imagination, that masterpiece of his malice; that spreads honey on the cup that you may drink poison; that strews roses over thorns, thorns sharp and big as spears; that semblance of beauty which beckons you to the desert [sic]; that apple of gold with the heart of ashes; that foul image, with the veil of excellence; that mist of the maremma, glowing with roseate hues beneath the sun, that creates it, and beautifies it, to destroy you; that

diadem of nettles; that spear, broken in your heart! He, the damned and triumphant one, sat meditating many thousand years for the conclusion, the consummation, the final crown, the seal of all misery, which he set on man's brain and heart to doom him to endless torment; and he created the Imagination. And then we are told the fault is ours; good and evil are sown in our hearts, and ours is the tillage, ours the harvest; and can this justify an omnipotent deity that he permits one particle of pain to subsist in this world? Oh, never.

(244)

Beatrice's diatribe both attacks the imagination for its delusional qualities and celebrates its terrible power, revealing the extent of her bitterness about her experiences. Beatrice concludes her attack on religious, social, political and domestic dogma by assuring Euthanasia that 'if I have said that which appears to you blasphemy; I will unveil my heart to you, tell you my sufferings, and surely you will then curse with me the author of my being' (246), which Shelley entertainingly describes as 'my Anathema'.³⁵ Beatrice's central attack on the imagination combines painful self-awareness – she is driven to her own destruction by her imaginative self-identification as prophetess – with Shelley's own ambivalent vision of the problems of human creativity: the imagination is both creative and destructive, and she is aware that the creativity celebrated by her husband and parents contains the seeds of violence and disorder.

Euthanasia attempts to remedy Beatrice's distress by reformulating her nightmarish vision of the powers of the imagination with a calmer, more rational one, telling her friend a parable of the human soul as a 'vast cave' (262), figuring Consciousness as 'a centinel at the entrance', with the emotions waiting behind him. In 'the vestibule of this cavern', Euthanasia describes Memory, Judgement and Reason, surrounded by Joy, Fear, Hope, together with 'Religion ... and Charity, or sometimes in their place, their counterfeits or opposites, Hypocrisy, Avarice and Cruelty' (262). In the dark, 'Conscience sits' and behind him, the Imagination. Euthanasia's parable of the human personality shows her combination of rational discourse with imaginative power; unfortunately, it fails to console Beatrice, driven to despair by her bitter life experiences. In *Valperga*, Shelley balances her characterisation of Euthanasia as a Renaissance female philosopher, able to pursue, at least for a while, an enlightened, republican agenda in the public sphere of Italy's divided politics, with her representation of Beatrice as an unstable and destabilising force, foreshadowing the counter-revolutionary fears of the female philosopher figure. Whereas

35 In a Letter to Maria Gisborne dated 6 May [1823], Mary Shelley asks 'Did the end of Beatrice surprise you. I am surprised that none of these Literary Gazettes are shocked – I feared that they would stumble over a part of what I read to you & still more over my Anathema', *The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley*, vol. 1, ed. Betty T. Bennett (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 336.

Euthanasia represents Shelley's ideal of female agency, fatally circumscribed in the novel by Castruccio's martial ambitions, she uses Beatrice to both voice and embody criticisms of the patriarchal system which valorises Castruccio's selfish and destructive career above the revolutionary potential of Euthanasia's reasoned, empathetic standpoint.

The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck (1830), Shelley's second historical novel, set in late fifteenth-century Britain and Europe after the defeat of the Plantagenets at the Battle of Bosworth Field, reformulates the way in which the female philosopher figure was historicised in *Valperga* in order to suggest new possibilities for female agency, focusing on the peaceful potential of love, duty and domesticity in the Euthanasia-like form of Katherine Gordon.³⁶ Shelley recalibrates the female philosopher motif in the figures of the Spanish Monina De Faro, a Christian Arab like Safie in *Frankenstein*, and the Scottish princess Katherine Gordon, who concludes the novel with an affecting apologia for her widowhood at the court of the enemy of her husband, Henry VII. Betty Bennett argues that Katherine and Monina function in this novel in a similar way to Euthanasia and Beatrice in *Valperga*:

In *Valperga*, Mary Shelley introduced the fictional characters Euthanasia and Beatrice, the one to impart to her story her republican ideals; the other to function as victim of the system. In *Perkin Warbeck*, her anti-power idealism is fictionalized into the voice of Katherine Gordon, who actually was Richard's wife; and Monina de Faro, a fictionalized adopted sister, victim of her belief in the system and her own blind love for Richard.³⁷

Like Beatrice, Monina is shown to be misguided in her beliefs: her unquestioning support for Richard's doomed campaign is socially and personally destructive. On the other hand, also like her pseudo-prophetic forebear, she is able to voice revolutionary attacks on the corrupt establishment of the Tudor court which are treated sympathetically, and connect her to the revolutionary debates of the 1790s and Shelley's reformist sympathies developing over the course of the 1820s and 1830s. *Perkin Warbeck* represents an optimistic development from *Valperga* in Shelley's treatment of her second, contrasting female philosopher

36 Although critics have begun to reassess Mary Shelley's later novels, the dismissal of them in criticism such as Pamela Clemit's *The Godwinian Novel: The Rational Fictions of Godwin, Brockden Brown and Mary Shelley* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), in which she argues in a footnote that *Perkin Warbeck*, *Lodore* and *Falkner* 'show an increased conformity to social and financial pressures and are not studied here' (138), still holds some traction. I argue that the three later novels reveal a more mature, nuanced and sophisticated engagement with Wollstonecraft's textual legacy than the anxious, pessimistic early novels.

37 Betty T. Bennett, *Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley: An Introduction* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 89. Subsequent references in-text, as *An Introduction*.

figure, Katherine Gordon, an actual historical figure, unlike the fictional Beatrice, Euthanasia and Monina, who survives the tragic action of the novel to enunciate a philosophy based on forgiveness, compassion and resilience.

Shelley's second historical novel, like *Valperga*, also engages with the cultural legacy of Scott's fiction, testing the limits of Scott's historical imagination. In Scott's novels, such as *Guy Mannering* and *Rob Roy* (discussed above), he focuses on protagonists who have either lost their legitimate inheritance, or have had it challenged at the beginning of the novel. For Fiona Robertson, Scott's Waverley novels 'are literally histories of restored legitimacy', arguing that 'All these novels tell not merely of miraculous recoveries of life and fortune but also of the restoration of something which is regarded as socially and legally just'.³⁸ Linking this theme to Scott's historical moment, between the end of the Napoleonic Wars and the passing of the Great Reform Act of 1832, Robertson states that 'the Waverley novels are distinctively post-Revolutionary fictions, telling stories of providential restoration of individuals and nations' (*Legitimate Histories*, 9). In *Perkin Warbeck*, Shelley subverts Scott's schema, analysing the social and personal costs of seeking restoration, revealing the fictions underpinning such providential narratives. Shelley's novel imagines that Richard Plantagent survived his uncle Richard III's plot to murder him when he was imprisoned in the tower as a young boy. In the novel, Richard is disguised as 'Perkin Warbeck', an actual historical figure who claimed to be Richard and mounted a series of attempted invasions during Henry VII's reign. Shelley both follows the outline of the historical career of Warbeck, which became more and more desperate, and imaginatively creates a courageous, moral framework for Richard's decisions in the novel. However, the tide of history ensures that Richard, unlike the fictional Harry Bertram and Frank Osbaldistone in Scott's novels, is unable to reclaim his legitimate position as heir to the throne. Richard's tragic trajectory towards Perkin Warbeck's historical execution is offset by Shelley's more optimistic treatment of the fate of his wife, Katherine.

Shelley reverses the pessimistic conclusions of *Valperga*, in which she scrutinised a society which marginalised women to its own cost, in *Perkin Warbeck*, which shows how women's support of masculine endeavour is essential to the public sphere of political action. Richard, the novel's semi-historical tragic hero, is shown to depend on the actions of important female figures in his life, from his courageous aunt, Lady Brampton, and his sister Elizabeth, unhappily married to his enemy Henry VII, to his childhood friend, Monina, and wife, Katherine. Shelley also stresses the extent to which Henry depends on his legitimacy as Tudor king for his marriage to the Plantagenet Elizabeth. Upon his last almost successful escape, before he is entrapped by Henry's wiles, Richard wonders to himself: 'that, in every adversity, women had been his resource and support; their energies, their undying devotion and enthusiasm, were the armour and weapons

38 Fiona Robertson, *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 8. Subsequent references, in-text.

with which he had defended himself from and attacked fortune'.³⁹ Outside the cottage of Jane Shore, his father's concubine, for a second time, Richard looks back on the aid he has received from her, and other women, and is aware, as other of Shelley's male heroes have not been, that he is in these women's debt. Richard's use of military language both points to women's importance beyond the domestic sphere and, more ambiguously, to the violence he forces upon both his family and friends, and the nation.

Monina de Faro, the first of Shelley's female philosopher figures in the novel, is perhaps Richard's staunchest supporter, staying true to his cause until her death. However, she is less Bennett's 'victim of her belief in the system' and more an avatar of radical critique in that system. Monina acts courageously throughout the novel, rescuing Richard when he is injured in his early campaign fighting with the Spaniards against Moorish strongholds; petitioning his sister Elizabeth to plead his case with her callous husband, Henry VII; organising a meeting of Plantagenet sympathisers in London; and rousing rebellion amongst Cornish peasants for Richard's last desperate assault on Henry's dominion. Although Monina is portrayed sympathetically throughout, and is shielded from fall or ruin through her steadfast devotion to her principles, Shelley uses the failure of her cause and her death in exile with her father to comment on the failure of radical hopes in the French Revolution, faced with the solidification of autocratic governments in the 1830s. She makes it clear that Monina has been seduced by the romance of Richard's doomed campaign: 'All these words, king, victory, and court, wove a golden tissue before the ardent girl's eyes ... [and] she knew not that night was falling upon her, while still she fancied that she advanced towards the ever-retreating splendour of the sky' (*The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck*, 105). Monina passionately and rationally champions Richard, who, in Shelley's retelling, has a legitimate claim to the throne. However, *Perkin Warbeck* explores the extent to which powerful figures such as Henry VII can establish a pretended form of legitimacy through force. Monina is both unable and unwilling to recognise this, leading to the disappointment of her hopes and her downcast exit from the novel after Richard's defeat.

Shelley uses the contingent nature of Henry VII's reign – he depends on his politically expedient, loveless marriage to Richard's niece for his political legitimacy – to reflect upon the procedures behind the resurgence of autocratic regimes across Europe gathering pace throughout the 1820s.⁴⁰ These included the restoration of the Bourbon monarchy in France after Napoleon's defeats in 1814 and 1815, which, in spite of the imposition of a written constitution, was viewed as the restitution of the *ancien régime* in the country, and the much more conservative, and violent, restoration of Ferdinand VII of Spain,

39 Mary Shelley, *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck* [1830], ed. Doucet Devin Fischer in *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 5. (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996), 352. Subsequent references, in-text.

40 Jonathan Sperber, *Revolutionary Europe, 1780–1850* (Harlow: Longman, 2000) analyses the return of autocratic regimes across Europe in the post-Napoleonic era, discussing the conservative emphasis on 'legitimacy, hierarchy, and patriarchy', 295.

determined to rule as an absolute despot, and refusing the constitution forced on France. By 1830, the year *Perkin Warbeck* was published, the unpopular rule of Charles X in France had been challenged by the more liberal Louis Phillipe, leading to the former's abdication and exile, and Ferdinand's rule in Spain was increasingly contested in Spain.⁴¹ Contemporary tumult over the legitimacy of these regimes fed into Shelley's portrait of the unrest facing Henry VII after his victory at the Battle of Bosworth.

In contrast to Monina de Faro, Katherine Gordon, the second, and more successful, of the novel's female philosophers, consistently counsels Richard to give up his anachronistic and destructive hopes for the throne and to retire into domestic anonymity with her: 'The Lady Katherine saw a vain mask in all the common-place pomp of palaces; she perceived that power failed most, when its end was good; she saw that accomplishing its purpose in the cottage, or in halls of state, felicity resulted from the affections only' (291). Katherine's conclusion here shows how Shelley has adapted Godwin's recalibration of the position of the domestic affections in his political philosophy in his *Memoirs* (discussed in Chapter 1), placing the affections as the motivating factor of virtue in both private and public spheres.

For Richard, as for Monina, foregoing his legitimate claim to the throne is unthinkable, and leads to both their deaths. Katharine, on the other hand, survives and is the first example of a surviving female philosopher in Shelley's corpus. Katherine succeeds where earlier female philosopher figures – Frankenstein's creature, Euthanasia and Beatrice – fail. She differs from her predecessors by successfully integrating elements of the Enlightenment iteration of the female philosopher – rational discussion, political awareness and religious devotion – with aspects of the Romantic heroine: particularly in Katherine's case, an emphasis on love and compassion, over and above the focus on creativity, the imagination and naturalness, which proves debilitating to women from Corinne and Landon's Improvisatrice to Shelleyan heroines such as Elizabeth Lavenza.

Perkin Warbeck's conclusion begins with a footnote, in which Shelley positions Katherine as 'a favourite of mine' and the epilogue as an apologia for 'her abode in Henry the Seventh's court, and other acts of her life' (395). Shelley allows Katherine to 'speak for herself, and show how her conduct, subsequent to her husband's death, was in accordance with the devotion and fidelity with which she attended his fortunes during his life' (395). Shelley's opening gambit is disingenuous: Katherine's defence of her behaviour provides the moral of the novel. Katherine's position as 'a favourite' of Shelley's suggestively connects the character's status as a widow in a hostile environment with her creator's authorial position in the England of the 1830s, similarly widowed and lonely.

41 Michael Broers, *Europe After Napoleon: Revolution, Reaction and Romanticism, 1814–1848* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996) offers a detailed overview of the effect of the Congress of Vienna after Napoleon's defeat at the Battle of Waterloo on the post-war governance of Europe, particularly in his useful first chapter, 9–18.

Katherine begins her apologia by focusing on the self-centredness of humanity's view of the universe, arguing that 'Even those, who as they fancy, sacrifice themselves for the love of God, do it more truly for love of themselves; and the followers of virtue too often see their duties through the obscure and deceptive medium, which their own single, individual feelings create' (398). Katherine's argument pinpoints the ego-driven self-deceptions of both Monina and Richard and goes on to suggest the remedy for such in 'love, charity, or sympathy [which] teaches us to feel pain at others' pain, joy in their joy' (398). Katherine's incisive insight into mankind's self-delusions reveals her lineage as a female philosopher, whilst her suggested solution connects her to the developing figure of the Romantic heroine, marking the domestic sphere as a feminine alternative to the power struggles in the political realm. Her contrast between the self-love which obscures and deceives Richard and Monina and the benevolence she advocates herself also links her to Godwin's position in *Political Justice*, in which he argues that disinterested benevolence is the only possible virtuous position (discussed in Chapter 1).

Katherine insists upon her femininity, using it to make a sly point about women's lack of education: 'I am a woman, with a woman's tutelage in my early years, a woman's education in the world, which is that of the heart – alas! for us – not of the head. I have no school-learning, no logic – but simply the voice of my own soul which speaks within me' (398). This statement echoes the position of Hays's earlier heroine, Emma Courtney, who argues that she is 'neither a philosopher, nor a heroine, but a *woman, to whom education has given a sexual character*'.⁴² Katherine's emphasis on her femininity and her lack of education here forges a connection between her and Hays's infamous heroine from the 1790s. This echo reveals a continuity of thought from the mid-1790s to the late 1820s in two women writers connected, in their different ways, friend and daughter, to Wollstonecraft's cultural legacy. Katherine then uses the accession of her heart above her head to excuse the continuance and development of her affections after her husband's death: 'And must my living heart be stone, because that dear form is dust, which was the medium of my communication with his spirit?' (400). Instead of wallowing in grief, Katherine argues for her continued usefulness: 'Where I see suffering, there I must bring my mite for its relief. We are not deities to bestow in impassive benevolence. We give, because we love ...' (400). Bennett argues that Katherine 'exemplifies a microcosmic conduit to socio-political reform as subversive as, but arguably more idealized than, Euthanasia's republicanism' (*An Introduction*, 90). For Shelley, Lady Katherine Gordon is the first of her successful female philosophers, able to assert her femininity as an aspect of her philosophical system. This success depends on the sublimation of the female philosopher figure's revolutionary elements, dangerously evident in Monina's character, within the Romantic heroine's emphasis on the feminine qualities of love and compassion.

42 Mary Hays, *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), ed. Marilyn L. Brooks (Peterborough: Broadview, 2000), 149.

Female domination: Mothers, daughters and philosophy in Shelley's *Lodore* and Gore's *Mrs Armytage*

Take a pair of pistols and a pack of cards, a cookery-book and a set of new quadrilles; mix them up with half an intrigue and a whole marriage, and divide them into three equal portions.

Benjamin Disraeli, *The Young Duke* (1829)

Benjamin Disraeli's playful 'receipt' of what to include in a silver fork novel, focusing on duelling, dining and dancing; high life, gambling and gossip; and his publisher Henry Colburn's successful marketing strategy of publication in three volumes, wittily condenses the genre's fashionable allure and sense of superficiality into an engaging epithet. Silver fork fiction was a popular genre in the 1820s and 1830s, feeding middle-class interest in aristocratic excess with its nostalgic focus on the glitter and glamour of the Regency period, and both foreshadowing and resisting the encroaching moralism of the Victorian period. These Regency romances sound far distant from the revolutionary novels of the 1790s, with their intense debates on the need for radical change and stress on individual experience, replaced by a focus on fashion, ephemerality and artifice. Whereas Jacobin, and Anti-Jacobin, fiction looks forward to dreams, or nightmares, of the future, silver fork fiction is characterised by a nostalgia for the already legendary past of the 1810s, its mannered glamour being swept aside by proto-Victorian ideals of morality and propriety. However, silver fork novels *are* concerned with the consequences of the Reform Bill on society, just as much as 1790s' novels either lobbied for or resisted calls for change. And in the novels of Catherine Gore, one of the genre's most popular writers, silver fork fiction finds its proponent for powerful, often subtly transgressive, women. By comparing one of Gore's novels, *Mrs Armytage* (1836), subtitled *Female Domination*, with Mary Shelley's experiment with the silver fork genre, *Lodore* (1835), I connect both women's continuing engagement with the tradition of the female philosopher in their depictions of the fraught relationships between mothers and daughters.

Criticism on the silver fork novel has expanded in recent years, shifting from relative obscurity and dismissal to being read as a key bridge between Romantic period writing and the Victorians. Criticism focuses on reading audiences and concomitant anxieties about morality, the representation of space as a socio-political entity, and the genre's gender dynamics. Winifred Hughes argues that silver fork fiction caters to a developing middle-class taste both appalled and fascinated by the scandals of fashionable society, reading the elegiac mood of the genre as encapsulating the genre's by turns satirical and more sympathetic account of their subject matter.⁴³ Edward Copeland reads the representation of

43 See Winifred Hughes, 'Silver Fork Writers and Readers: Social Contexts of a Best Seller' *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 25.3 (1992): 328–47, for a detailed account of the genre's publishing history and reception, and her 'Elegies for the Regency: Catherine Gore's Dandy Novels' *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 50.2 (1995): 189–209, for a more detailed account of two of Gore's later novels *Cecil; or, the*

London in these novels as offering an alternative to Dickens' more famous caricatures – silver fork fiction allowing for the depiction of a more fluid, unstable capital city, prefiguring modernist representations of the moving metropolis.⁴⁴ April Kendra focuses on Gore's fiction as offering an alternative to male practitioners of the silver fork novel, Disraeli and Edward Bulwer-Lytton, arguing that the latter focus on the individual peregrinations of their dandy protagonists whereas Gore's fashionable novels centre on the cohesion of families and communities.⁴⁵ I argue that Shelley and Gore's silver fork fiction allows them to explore transgressive female behaviour in a genre which incorporates transgression within fashionable behaviour, often in the context of heterogeneous spaces: the wilds of America, the salons of Paris, parochial Yorkshire.

Shelley's *Lodore* begins with the ill-fated romance between its eponymous protagonist and Cornelia Sansterre, hinging on Lodore's false expectations of Cornelia's natural charm, undercut by her fashionable ambitions. The beginning of the novel flirts with silver fork fiction's generic patterning, with Cornelia's adulterous flirtation with a Polish count nearly leading to a duel between him and Lodore, before the latter realises that he would be fighting his own, unwitting, illegitimate son. Lodore flees to America to avoid the confrontation, raising his and Cornelia's child, Edith, as a perfectly passive, submissive and almost obstinately cheerful girl. Lodore's death leads to Edith's ambiguous social position back in London, forbidden by her father's vindictive will from making contact with her mother. Edith's marriage to the impecunious Villiers leads to their cat-and-mouse flight from debtor's prison. Edith's careless personality is contrasted with her friend, Fanny Derham's. Fanny functions as the novel's female philosopher, although Shelley concludes her novel by suggesting that the fate of the female philosopher cannot be written within the existing generic parameters of 1830s' fiction. The character who matures into self-awareness and accountability over the course of the novel is Lodore's widow, Cornelia, and it is through this new widow figure that Shelley develops the points made by Katherine Gordon at the end of *Perkin Warbeck*. It is Cornelia, rather than Ethel or Fanny, who represents the potential Shelley sees for female representation within the novel: a flawed woman able to overcome social and personal obstacles in order to protect her family and find forgiveness for her earlier vanity and pride.

Adventures of a Coxcomb (1841) and its sequel, *Cecil: A Peer* (1841). In this later article, Hughes sharpens her earlier criticism of the genre's nostalgic function as both satire and celebration of the Regency period.

44 See Edward Copeland, 'Crossing Oxford Street: Silverfork Geopolitics' *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25.2 (2001): 116–34, for his account of the genre's literary geographies. Copeland develops this thesis in his monograph, *The Silver Fork Novel: Fashionable Fiction in the Age of Reform* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012), in which he argues that silver fork novels constitute 'the cognitive map of contemporary commercial culture', 20.

45 See April Kendra, 'Gendering the Silver Fork: Catherine Gore and the Society Novel' *Women's Writing* 11.1 (2004): 25–38, for her account of the different gender dynamics of the dandy novel compared to the society novel.

Gore's *Mrs Armytage* affords a different perspective on the relationship between its titular character, a mother and widow like Cornelia, and her children. Caroline Armytage dominates her parish of Yorkshire, acting as a female Justice of the Peace, at a time when women were debarred from holding such office. Throughout the novel, Gore stresses how successful and beneficent Mrs Armytage is as a landowner and estate manager. However, the novel focuses on Caroline's cold and distant relationships with her daughter, Sophia, her son, Arthur, and his wife, Marian – Mrs Armytage's success in the public sphere comes at the expense of her domestic affections, with her determination to decide on the future of her children leading to the heart-broken demise of Sophie and the near alienation of her son and daughter-in-law. Although Gore's novel diverges from the London-centric focus of many silver fork novels, *Mrs Armytage* still thinks through the confrontation between new money and aristocracy which contributes to the genre's success. Like *Lodore*, it also focuses on eccentric relationships between mothers and daughters, offering new perspectives on the maternal role.

Lodore separates mother from daughter for much of the novel, making their reconciliation its climax and happy ending. Instead, Shelley focuses on the daughter's miseducation at the hands of her father. Lodore's treatment of Ethel in America follows the brand of female education critiqued by Wollstonecraft in her *Vindication*, down to the fact that Lodore 'drew his chief ideas from Milton's Eve'.⁴⁶ Wollstonecraft criticises Milton's portrayal of Eve, alluding to his representation of her as a perfect, obedient beauty, because:

when he tells us that women are formed for softness and sweet attractive grace, I cannot comprehend his meaning, unless, in the true Mahometan strain, he meant to deprive us of souls, and insinuate that we were beings only designed by sweet attractive grace, and docile blind obedience, to gratify the senses of man when he can no longer soar on the wing of contemplation.

(*Vindication*, 88)

She also reveals Milton's inconsistency by contrasting Eve's speech to Adam in which she tells him 'what thou bidst/*Unargued* I obey; so God ordains;/God is *thy law, thou mine*' with Adam's argument with God that 'Among *unequals* what society/Can sort, what harmony or true delight?' (89, original emphasis). Shelley's allusion to Wollstonecraft's critique of Milton's Eve in *Lodore* achieves multiple aims: first, it gestures back to her representation of Safie in *Frankenstein*; secondly, it sharpens her own critique of Lodore's miseducation of Ethel; and finally, as the allusion is implicit – the reader must make the

46 Mary Shelley, *Lodore* [1835], ed. Fiona Stafford *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 6. (London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996), 18. Subsequent references, in-text.

connection between Shelley's use of Milton's Eve and Wollstonecraft's for themselves, Shelley uses Wollstonecraft as a silent partner in her attack on continuing poor standards of education. Indeed, Lisa Vargo argues that 'Lodore may be conceived as an imaginary conversation with Mary Wollstonecraft'.⁴⁷

Wollstonecraft's arguments act as a bridge between Milton and Shelley, as demonstrated in her analysis of the defects in Ethel's education:

A lofty sense of independence is, in man, the best privilege of his nature. It cannot be doubted, but that it were for the happiness of the other sex that she were taught more to rely on and act for herself. But in the cultivation of this feeling, the education of Fitzhenry was lamentably deficient. Ethel was taught to know herself dependent ... She seldom thought, and never acted, for herself.

(*Lodore*, 19)

Ethel is given a sexual education by her father, making her dependent on him: passive, docile, unquestioning. She is denied independence, and is therefore rendered unthinking and passive. Over the course of the novel, Shelley tests Lodore's assertion that the 'worst ills of life, penury and desertion, she could never know' (19). Starting with Lodore's death at the end of volume I, Ethel's happiness is tested by her father's vindictive will against his wife, leaving Ethel in a tenuous social position, and her relationship with the prodigal Villiers beset with the dangers of debt, poverty and imprisonment. Over the course of the novel, Shelley shows just how poorly Lodore has equipped Ethel for life, although Ethel remains disarmingly oblivious to most of her trials.

Ethel's passivity seems to connect her to the daughter figure in Gore's Mrs Armytage, Sophia. Sophie's education has also disciplined her into dependence, rendering her as a passive, uncomplaining foil to her imperious mother and impulsive brother. She acts as peacekeeper and go-between in her turbulent household. However, Sophie is feelingly alive to her own predicament, which forces her to subordinate her own pleasures and desires to others, whereas Ethel remains blithely unconcerned. Sophia Armytage closely resembles eighteenth-century iterations of the female philosopher figure, who often counselled stoic resignation in the face of life's disappointments. For example, her best friend Lady Laura Greta admires Sophie's 'patient mildness of demeanour with which [she] bestowed her attention' on some tiresome visitors, reflecting:

for Sophia was the least selfish person in the world. Reared under the wing of a self-idolatress, she had been fortunate enough to acquire that best and truest tenet of philosophy, that

47 Lisa Vargo, 'Further Thoughts on the Education of Daughters: Lodore as an Imagined Conversation with Mary Wollstonecraft' in *Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley: Writing Lives*, eds. Buss et al. (Peterborough: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001), 178.

what happiness we justly call/ Subsists not in the good of one, but all.

She had a really noble mind, – for it made her sensible of her own insignificance.⁴⁸

Sophia's utilitarian ethics come at the cost of her own happiness and, indeed, her life. To placate her mother, enraged at Arthur's choice of a wife, Sophie hands over control of her love life to her mother. Mrs Armytage refuses the advances of Sophia's one true love, without consulting her daughter. Sophia's suitor marries another, and Sophie pines away, eventually dying of a broken heart. Her philosophical resignation destroys her, in a surprising spin on earlier female philosopher narratives. Female philosophers throughout the 1790s are destroyed either by patriarchal restrictions on a woman's agency or a fatal flirtation with dangerously French radicalism. Sophia dies because of her mother's uncaring machinations.

Although Sophia superficially resembles Ethel in her passivity and state of dependence, her philosophical approach to life compares her to Shelley's female philosopher figure in *Lodore*, Fanny Derham. *Lodore* contrasts Ethel's sexual education with her friend Fanny Derham's intellectual pursuits. Fanny's father, Lodore's childhood friend, has educated his daughter 'in the dead languages, and other sorts of abstruse learning, which seldom make a part of a girl's education' (79). Shelley positions Fanny as her female philosopher figure in the novel: 'Fanny, to use her own singular language, loves philosophy, and pants after knowledge' (79). When Ethel meets Fanny again in London, Shelley develops her character:

Such a woman as Fanny was more made to be loved by her own sex than by the opposite one. Superiority of intellect, joined to acquisitions beyond those usual even to men; and both announced with frankness, though without pretension, forms a kind of anomaly little in accord with masculine taste. Fanny could not be the rival of women, and, therefore, all her merits were appreciated by them.

(214)

Shelley refocuses the threatening aspects of female philosophers from the 1790s here, by making Fanny attractive to women, instead of a dangerous influence, and only distasteful to men, rather than a destabilising sexual presence. In fact, by defusing the threat of the female philosopher, Shelley unsexes, or desexualises, Fanny Derham – stating here that she 'could not be a rival of women' in men's affections, and also that, compared to Ethel, whom marriage and social status have made a woman, Fanny 'was still a mere girl' (205). Shelley

48 Catherine Gore, *Mrs Armytage; or, Female Domination* (London: Henry Colburn, 1836), 77–8.

reformulates the dangerously sexual allure of revolutionary-era female philosophers in her portrait of Fanny as an intellectual woman, whose learning and accomplishments make her more attractive to other women than men. Fanny's threat to men, still present in this description, is intellectual rather than sexual. With her, Shelley focuses on the philosopher in the female philosopher.

Fanny remains a subsidiary character in the novel's drive to reunite estranged mother to docile daughter, an active, intellectual foil to Ethel's passive, unthinking patience. Shelley teasingly closes the novel by suggesting Fanny's future life:

it is not in a few tame lines that we can revert to the varied fate of Fanny Derham ... One who feels so deeply for others, and yet is so stern a censor over herself – at once so sensitive and so rigidly conscientious – so single-minded and upright, and yet open as day to charity and affection, cannot hope to pass from youth to age unharmed ... What the events are, that have already diversified her existence, cannot now be recounted; and it would require the gift of prophecy to foretell the conclusion. In after times these may be told, and the life of Fanny Derham be presented as a useful lesson, at once to teach what goodness and genius can achieve in palliating the woes of life, and to encourage those, who would in any way imitate her, by an example of calumny refuted by patience, errors rectified by charity, and the passions of our nature purified and ennobled by an undeviating observance of those moral laws on which all human excellence is founded – a love of truth in ourselves, and a sincere sympathy with our fellow-creatures.

(313)

Shelley idealises Fanny's role as female philosopher here, contrasting her passionate feelings with self-censorship, her sense and sensibility. Fanny is a model of goodness and genius. By refuting calumny with patience, and rectifying error with charity, she closely resembles Ellis in Burney's *The Wanderer*, who similarly persevered in her upright, moral course when surrounded by suspicion and gossip. Her combination of passion and observance of moral laws connects her to Godwin's representation of Wollstonecraft in the *Memoirs*. Shelley positions 'the fate of Fanny Derham' as unwritable within the literary conventions of the 1830s: her past 'cannot now be recounted', her future is unforetold. Shelley delays telling her story indefinitely, hinting at the 'useful lesson' to be gained from her idealised status as female philosopher.

Both Shelley and Gore's novels focus their attention on the mother figure in their texts – Cornelia plays a reconciliatory role in *Lodore's* conclusion, whereas Caroline almost transfigures into the antagonist of her eponymous novel, with her connivances leading to her daughter's death and her son's near estrangement. With Ethel educated into desultory domesticity and Fanny remaining only a potential force for good, it falls to Ethel's estranged mother, Cornelia, a vain, spoilt socialite, to engineer the novel's final reconciliations. Cornelia's mother, the pointedly named Lady Santerre ('sans' and 'terre':

without land or earth) educates her daughter to make a good match, to return her to the social position she has lost through her dead husband's profligacy and his family's persecution, particularly the brother's choice 'to consider the wife most to blame' (40) for their dire economic situation. This situation wryly nods both to Shelley's early married life to Percy – the first of many such resemblances throughout the novel – and to her current dependence on Sir Timothy Shelley's grudging support for her and his grandson. The Santerre brother's blame of Lady Santerre further suggests that it is the women in relationships who suffer for the partnership's profligacy.

Lady Santerre's hopes for her daughter, that she will make a 'splendid match' (41) to return them both to the fashionable world is comically played off against Lodore's bucolic expectations, figuring Cornelia as 'a girl radiant in innocence and youth, the nursling, so he fancied, of mountains, waterfalls, and solitude; yet endowed with all the softness and refinement of civilized society' (41). The opening section of *Lodore* deals with the disintegration of its hero's expectations about his wife, and Shelley's subtle critique of his behaviour. First of all, the expectations themselves are obviously oxymoronic: Lodore views Cornelia as both a 'natural' woman, raised in seclusion and innocent of fashionable vices, and 'civilized' by its veneer of respectability. Further, his desire for 'unquestioning submission' sounds an ominous note in their relationship, which Shelley exploits in her rendition of their unhappy married life.

Rather than the social innocent Lodore expects, Cornelia has been brought up 'to view society as the glass by which she has to set her feelings, and by which to adapt her conduct' (44). Lodore's plans for her improvement are soured by the miseducation she has received from her mother, who has 'exerted herself to secure her empire over Cornelia; she spared neither flattery nor artifice; and, well acquainted as she was with every habit and turn of her daughter's mind, her task was comparatively easy' (44). Shelley shows both Cornelia's potential for improvement and Lodore's inability to tutor his wife effectively, through his wounded pride and sense of alienation. So, Cornelia 'was ignorant, accustomed to the most frivolous employments, shrinking from any mental exercise, so that although her natural abilities were great, they lay dormant' (44) and Lodore refuses to teach her differently from her mother, as he 'disdained to enforce by authority, that which he thought ought to be yielded by love'. Shelley focuses on his error here:

he had married one so young, that her education, even if its foundation had been good, required finishing, and who as it was, had every thing to learn ... a tutor can do nothing without authority, either open or concealed – a tutor must sacrifice his own pursuits and immediate pleasures, to study and adapt himself to the disposition of his pupil.

(45)

Shelley shows how Cornelia's character flaws are worsened by the clash between her mother's cynical, social machinations and her husband's false

ideals (his false delicacy, even). Through Cornelia, Shelley critiques both masculine expectations that women be 'natural' and the social forces which encourage affectation and disguise. Cornelia is caught between her mother's Machiavellian schemes and her husband's refusal to counter these plots because of his unrealistic ideals. She is only able to fulfil her intellectual and emotional potential after the death of both her husband and mother: a fact which must have resonated with Shelley's own situation, overshadowed by the figures of Percy Shelley and Mary Wollstonecraft.

As Ethel remains impassive throughout the novel and Fanny's actions are indescribable, Shelley focuses more and more on the maturation of Cornelia Lodore as the driving force of the novel's action. Between the 'masculine' ideal of Ethel's sexualised education in submissiveness and the feminist ideals of Fanny, Cornelia charts a realistic course of development in the novel: flawed, proud, sometimes unyielding, beholden to social convention, Cornelia manages to negotiate the public world of economic transaction for the benefit of her family, selflessly sacrificing her own concerns in order to ensure her daughter's happiness, although Shelley orchestrates the conclusion of the novel to meet Cornelia's desires.

Caroline, the eponymous heroine-villain of *Mrs Armytage*, is as flawed, proud, and unyielding as Cornelia. She too is able to negotiate the public world of economic transaction, as well as being an astute socio-political manager. However, she is less concerned with the benefit of her family, and is shown to be selfish and self-centred throughout. Gore stresses how good Mrs Armytage is at managing the affairs of her estate, but she is more interested in how this effects the private sphere of the Armytage family, analysing the cool and restrained relationships between mother and children. Caroline receives a masculine education from her father, after the premature death of her elder brother:

She was taught to ride, to run, to settle with the steward and house-keeper, to parley with the farmers, to dispute with the tax-gatherers. A little Latin, and a great deal of arithmetic, bounded her accomplishments. Of music she knew nothing ...; or of dancing, except as an exercise far less invigorating than a gallop on the wolds. Law and theology, Blackstone and Tillotson, were the studies inculcated by her preceptor, the curate of the parish ...

(*Mrs Armytage*, I.26)

Caroline's unusual education suits her to manage her estate and take on a significant public role in Yorkshire, functioning as a darker reflection on Shelley's enlightened ruler, Euthanasia. The death of Caroline's husband leaves her 'sole arbitress' over her children. Throughout the novel, Gore stresses how successful Caroline is at running affairs. For example, her son Arthur watches her converse with several gentlemen at a society dinner she has organised:

[N]ever did his mother appear to such advantage as when presiding over the pomp of such an entertainment; proud of her well-ordered hospitality,

her well-selected society ... Eminently well-informed on all topics which interest the abler class of country gentlemen, Mrs Armytage ... knew all, in short, which an extensive landed proprietor ought to know; and displayed her knowledge, not for the sake of display, but for the promotion of conversation.

(III.40)

Gore makes Caroline into an English version of the French *salonnières* she affects to despise. In her public role, Caroline Armytage resembles the ideal of female agency of mid-eighteenth-century philosophers, such as Hume, Voltaire and Diderot, discussed in my introduction.

However successful Mrs Armytage is in the public sphere, however, her private life is riven with disputes and disagreements. Her pride and ambition lead her to tyrannise over her children: Arthur rebels, refusing to follow her plans for his career and choosing a lower status wife for himself; Sophia tries to conciliate her mother, leading to her heartbroken demise when Caroline arbitrarily and secretly dismisses her suitor's advances. In the climax of the novel, Arthur angrily reveals a secret codicil to his grandfather's will which gives him, not his mother, control of the Holywell estate, leading to Caroline's angry departure on a European tour. Unbeknownst to Arthur, his mother is already dying and they are only reunited when he tracks her down and brings her back to Yorkshire to die, finally humbled and repentant. Copeland analyses the end of the novel, which sees Arthur's wife, Marian, instated in her proper place as the new Mrs Armytage: 'The sanctified British names of Arthur, Marian, and Holywell apotheosize the new political alliance of Holywell (the country gentry) with Baker Street/Portland Place (colonial money, plus connections in Ireland and America) in a reformed Whig constellation of power' ('Silverfork Geopolitics', 131). Power shifts from Caroline's old money to Marian's new, from mother to daughter-in-law.

Whereas Mrs Armytage is humiliated and dies, repentant, at the conclusion of Gore's novel, Shelley's *Lodore* reunites Ethel with Lady Lodore in a highly wrought, sentimental climax. Daughter and mother have been split apart by Lodore's vindictive will, social circumstances and misunderstandings. They are brought back together by Cornelia's sublimation of her selfish actions into personal and economic sacrifices in order to stabilise Ethel and Villiers' finances. Cornelia represents a female figure positioned between Fanny's female philosopher and Ethel's domestic woman: neither intellectually distanced from sexuality like Fanny, nor educated into passivity like Ethel, she charts a course between competing representations of womanhood in the contemporary literature of the 1830s in order to show the potential to exist beyond such categorisations. Cornelia's position outside the binary represented by Ethel and Fanny, of passive femininity against unwritable rationality, and her flawed, though improving personality, connects her to Edgeworth's earlier character, Lady Delacour – both female characters who resist easy categorisation and exist on the boundaries of conventional behaviour.

Throughout her writing career, Mary Shelley experiments with different iterations of the female philosopher, finding a monstrous male version in Frankenstein's creature, figures cast back in time in Euthanasia and Beatrice, Katherine Gordon and Monina de Faro, and in the contemporary Fanny Derham, whose fate, however, remains unwritten within the constraints of the silver fork genre. However, Shelley is as interested in the limitations of these characters as much as in the opportunities they offer for female agency. As she matures in confidence as a writer, the female philosopher is superseded by another figure: a wife, a widow, a mother, who demonstrates resilience in the face of immense challenges; who focuses on the domestic affections of love and forbearance; who survives.

5 Afterword

The afterlives of the female philosopher

In the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, the female philosopher represented competing visions of the thinking woman. She both embodied Enlightenment ideals of the progress of civilisation, an avatar of rationality and refinement, and expressed anxieties about female agency, a nightmarish figure of intellectual, sexual and social threat. Romantic period women writers increasingly treated this figure as representational, a literary construct which allowed them to engage with political and cultural arguments about female expression. As the nineteenth century progressed, the female philosopher's hold on the feminist imagination became more diffuse.

I would like to conclude with a brief analysis of the female philosopher figure's afterlife in Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*, published at the end of the Post-Napoleonic era, the year before a new series of revolutions rocked the European continent. Published in 1847, 50 years after Wollstonecraft's death, Brontë's enduringly popular novel is a female *Bildungsroman*, a first person narrative detailing Jane's harsh treatment in her aunt's family; the abusive regime of Lowood School; her career as a governess at Thornfield Hall; her love affair with Mr Rochester, climaxing in the revelation of his attempted bigamy; Jane's escape and her fortuitous meeting with her cousins, the Rivers family; St John's proposal to her and her rejection of him; and her return to the ruined Thornfield, destroyed by Rochester's first wife Bertha Mason, concluding with Jane's marriage to the blind and maimed Rochester. *Jane Eyre* has been analysed from various critical perspectives, and is especially open to feminist, psychoanalytic and postcolonial interpretations.¹ It also fits, surprisingly readily, into the paradigm I have described throughout my thesis, in which contrasting female philosopher figures allow the woman writer to access and develop

1 Sandra M. Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979) (Yale: Yale Nota Bene, 2000) is propelled by its analysis of *Jane Eyre*, combining feminist and psychoanalytic approaches to explore Jane's self, split between her and Bertha Mason, who embodies her unarticulated rage. Gayatri C. Spivak, 'Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism' *Critical Inquiry* 12.1 (Autumn 1985): 243–61, analyses Brontë's *Jane Eyre* by contrasting it to Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Jean Rhys' *Wide Sargasso Sea*, initiating the postcolonial rereading of the text.

Wollstonecraft's feminist arguments.² In this conclusion, I will focus on the way in which Brontë's depictions of Helen Burns, Bertha Mason and Jane herself reflect upon the tradition of contrasting female philosopher figures in earlier nineteenth-century women's writing.

Jane meets Helen Burns at Lowood Institution. Helen is intellectual, self-denying and profoundly religious. She submits to the brutal regime at Lowood, instigated by the cruel-natured Mr Brocklehurst, because she receives a fuller education, in secret, from Miss Temple. Helen finally dies angelically of consumption; her death leads to the discovery of Brocklehurst's harsh treatment of his scholars, and the reformation of the school along more liberal lines. Helen is both a mentor for Jane – she guides the younger girl through her early experience of Lowood, helping her to benefit from Temple's teaching – and a warning figure – her passivity and submissiveness stultify Jane's passionate feelings. I suggest that Helen represents the Enlightenment iteration of the female philosopher taken to extremes: she combines rational study with intense religious feeling, leading to the attenuation of her bodily strength. Elaine Showalter describes her as 'the perfect victim and the representation of the feminine spirit in its most disembodied form'³: she is, effectively, all mind.

Helen's relationship with her teacher Miss Temple reveals the extent to which her characterisation parallels that of the positive, Enlightenment/revolutionary iteration of the female philosopher. Jane comments, wonderingly, on their shared learning:

They conversed of things I had never heard of; of nations and times past; of countries far away; of secrets of nature discovered and guessed at: they spoke of books: how many they had read! What stores of knowledge they possessed! Then they seemed so familiar with French names and French authors ...⁴

- 2 James Diedrick explores the connections between *Jane Eyre* and Wollstonecraft's feminist polemic in 'Jane Eyre and *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*' in *Approaches to Teaching Brontë's 'Jane Eyre'*, eds. Diane Long Hoeveler and Beth Lau (New York: MLA, 1993). Kirstin Hanley builds on Diedrick's suggestion by focusing on the way in which Brontë draws on Wollstonecraft's pedagogical suggestions in *Original Stories from Real Life*, in "'A New Servitude': Pedagogy and Feminist Practice in Brontë's *Jane Eyre*' *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies* 5.3 (Winter 2009) <<http://www.ncgsjournal.com/issue53/hanley.htm>> 28 September 2011. I differ from both Diedrick and Hanley by suggesting that Brontë must negotiate the vagaries of Wollstonecraft's posthumous reputation over the 50 years which had passed between Wollstonecraft's death and the publication of *Jane Eyre*, in order to access Wollstonecraft's feminist arguments. This means that, for Brontë, the female philosopher is an unavoidable figure in her reading of Wollstonecraft.
- 3 Elaine Showalter, *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing* (London: Virago, 1978), 115.
- 4 Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* (1847), ed. Stevie Davies (London: Penguin, 2003), 85. Subsequent references, in-text.

Helen shares with Miss Temple, and with earlier female philosophers such as Wollstonecraft and Hays, and their creations Maria and Emma, a love of reading, an international perspective, and, tellingly, an emphasis on French culture. By killing off Helen, Brontë subverts the tradition of the Enlightenment iteration of the female philosopher figure surviving her counter-revolutionary twin, at work in the novels of Elizabeth Hamilton, Maria Edgeworth, Burney and Austen (discussed in Chapters 2 and 3). In doing so, she suggests that Helen's extraordinary submissiveness and her extreme piety are unhelpful in the development of Jane's psyche.

Of course, the novel's off-stage climax, Bertha Mason's arson attack on Thornfield Hall, leads to her death too, clearing the way for Jane's companionate, egalitarian marriage to Rochester which concludes the novel. It is more difficult to align Bertha with the earlier tradition of the female philosopher figure, even in her most reactionary form. Mad, bad, and dangerous to know, Bertha is clearly *not* a philosopher. However, I argue that, as Helen is the Enlightenment iteration of the figure taken to extremes, so too is Bertha the counter-revolutionary version of the female philosopher warped to her paranoiac limit. In counter-revolutionary discourse, the female philosopher was presented as an oxymoron: women cannot be philosophers, it was argued, because their bodily responses to stimuli actively impeded thought. Bertha represents this misogynistic logic taken to its absolute, illogical extreme. In Jane's encounter with Bertha after the collapse of Rochester's wedding ceremony, Brontë stresses Bertha's bodily size and strength, her sensuality, over her intellect, because she has been driven to madness by her incarceration in Thornfield Hall.⁵ This focus on Bertha's body, at the expense of her reason, and even her humanity, aligns her with these reactionary attacks against the female philosopher, which strove to decouple the term, arguing that it was impossible for a female to be a philosopher. Moreover, when Jane first sees Bertha, she describes her as a 'clothed hyena' (*Jane Eyre*, 328), connecting her to Wollstonecraft who was described in her 1790s heyday as 'a hyena in petticoats'.⁶ When Bertha attacks Rochester, Jane describes her as 'a big woman, in stature almost equalling her husband, and corpulent besides: she showed virile force in the contest – more than once she almost throttled him, athletic as he was' (328). Bertha's nightmarish strength and violence, her size, and the fact that she can almost overcome her husband, also align her with Victor's fears about the female creature in *Frankenstein*. Bertha represents the nadir of male fears about the power of the female philosopher: combining almost mindless bodily strength with savage violence, underscored by profoundly threatening sexual power. Rochester himself hints at Bertha's dangerous sexual

5 Her imprisonment aligns her with earlier Gothic heroines, including Wollstonecraft's Maria.

6 Horace Walpole salutes his friend Hannah More in a letter dated 24 October 1795 as 'thou reverse of that hyena in petticoats, Mrs Wolstoncroft [sic]', *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. 31, 397. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence: Yale Edition* <<http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/page.asp?vol=31&page=397>> 4 October 2011.

energy when he describes her assault on him as ‘the sole conjugal embrace I am ever to know’ (328).

By exorcising first Helen Burns then Bertha Mason from the novel, Brontë creates a space for Jane Eyre to develop into her own kind of female philosopher, eschewing the pious passivity of Helen and restraining the inarticulate rage represented by Bertha’s aggression. Before Rochester’s arrival at Thornfield, Jane articulates a feminist disappointment at the narrowness of her existence:

It is in vain to say human beings ought to be satisfied with tranquillity: they must have action, and they will make it if they cannot find it. Millions are condemned to a stiller doom than mine, and millions are in silent revolt against their lot. Nobody knows how many rebellions besides political rebellions ferment in the masses of life which people earth. Women are supposed to be very calm generally: but women feel just as men feel; they need exercise for their faculties, and a field for their efforts as much as their brothers do; they suffer from too rigid a restraint, too absolute a stagnation, precisely as men would suffer; and it is narrow-minded in their more privileged fellow-creatures to say that they ought to confine themselves to making puddings and knitting stockings, to playing on the piano and embroidering bags. It is thoughtless to condemn them, or laugh at them, if they seek to do more or learn more than custom has pronounced necessary for their sex.

(129–30)

In this passage, Jane connects her feminist perception of women’s need for equality, improved education and increased access to the public sphere with her awareness of both personal and political rebellion, or revolution. Her reference to ‘political rebellions’ harks back to the tumult of the French Revolution, as well as foreshadowing the Revolutions of 1848, which would erupt across Europe, if not in Britain itself, the year after the publication of *Jane Eyre*.⁷

Jane’s criticism of men who argue that women should ‘confine themselves to making puddings and knitting stockings’, etc, connects her to Mary Hays, who similarly critiques women’s confinement to such activities, arguing in *Letters and Essays*, for example: ‘I doubt whether there will be any sewing in the next world, how then will those who employ themselves who have done nothing else in this?’⁸ Jane is also connected to Hays, and to the caricatured versions of Hays such as Hamilton’s Bridgetina Botherim and Edgeworth’s Harriet Freke, because of her plain, even ugly, exterior. Jane’s self-description focuses on her ‘want of beauty’:

7 For an overview of the 1848 Revolutions, see Jonathan Sperber, *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), which offers an interpretation which attempts ‘to connect the outbreak and course of the revolution with the social, economic and cultural changes of the preceding decades’, 2–3, comparing it to both the French Revolution of 1789 and the Russian Revolution of 1917.

8 Mary Hays, *Letters and Essays, Moral and Miscellaneous* (London: Knott, 1793), 34.

I sometimes regretted that I was not handsomer: I sometimes wished to have rosy cheeks, a straight nose, and small cherry mouth; I desired to be tall, stately and finely developed in figure; I felt it as a misfortune that I was so little, so pale, and had features so irregular and so marked.

(114)

As discussed in Chapter 1, Hays's appearance was often attacked instead of engaging with her feminist arguments; for example, Coleridge describes her as 'a thing, ugly and petticoated'.⁹ Hamilton describes Bridgetina, based on Hays, as short, ugly and, unlike Jane, who takes care of her dress, permanently dishevelled. Edgeworth's Freke is similarly irregular in appearance, described as disconcertingly masculine throughout *Belinda*. Brontë reworks the trajectory of Bridgetina and Harriet's, and even Emma Courtney's stories, in which Bridgetina falls back into a life of domesticity with her mother, Harriet is maimed in a mantrap as punishment for her unladylike behaviour, and Emma is denied a healthy relationship with the man she loves, in Jane's eventual marriage to Rochester. This marriage can be read as the belated triumph of the female philosopher figure represented by Bridgetina, Harriet and Emma, in earlier nineteenth-century women's writing.

In one sense, Jane's marriage to Rochester, signalled by her famous (almost) last words 'Reader, I married him' (*Jane Eyre*, 498), represents her reinscription back into a normative discourse of domesticity. In this reading, her refusal to accompany St John Rivers on his missionary enterprise to India shows her unwillingness, perhaps inability, to act in the public sphere. Instead, she chooses to return to and remain in the private sphere, restricting herself to the roles of wife and mother. As such, she follows in the footsteps of earlier female philosophers who return to the domestic sphere at the end of their novels, for example, Ellis in *The Wanderer* and Fanny in *Mansfield Park*. On the other hand, the conclusion to *Jane Eyre* stresses Jane's freedom of choice. In her discussions with St John about the manner in which she would be prepared to accompany him to India, she is clear that she is incapable of either marrying him or loving him in any capacity other than like a sister. When he tells her that 'undoubtedly enough of love would follow upon marriage to render the union right even in your eyes', she angrily replies, 'I scorn your idea of love ... I scorn the counterfeit sentiment you offer: yes, St John, and I scorn you when you offer it' (454). Later, discussing St John with Rochester, she tells him: 'He is good and great, but severe; and, for me, cold as an iceberg ... He sees nothing attractive in me; not even youth – only a few useful mental points ...' (493), implicitly contrasting St John's view of her with Rochester's. Jane rejects her reduction by St John to an intellectual pawn, embracing instead the mental, emotional and physical fulfilment of her life with Rochester. Showalter argues that *Jane Eyre* 'anticipates and indeed formulates the deadly combat between the Angel in the

9 Coleridge's description comes from a letter to Southey, quoted in M. Ray Adams' 'Mary Hays, Disciple of William Godwin' *PMLA* 55.2 (June 1940): 472–83, 473.

House and the devil in the flesh that is evident in the fiction of Virginia Woolf, Doris Lessing, Muriel Spark, and other twentieth-century British women novelists' (*A Literature of Their Own*, 112). She also accesses and reformulates an earlier tradition of contrasting female philosopher figures, in the intellectualism of Helen Burns and the threatening sexuality of Bertha Mason, destroying both in order to allow Jane to find her own balance: the balance, I suggest, which Hays searched for in her writing, especially *Emma Courtney*.

The destruction of the female philosopher figures in *Jane Eyre* does not represent the exorcism of Wollstonecraft's ghost from the corpus of women's writing. Instead, it allows for a reappraisal of the influence of Wollstonecraft's feminism on nineteenth-century women writers. The anxious division of female consciousness between conflicting representations of the female philosopher figure, which bedevils women's writing at the beginning of the century, stems from competing interpretations of Wollstonecraft's life and work. Opie's *Adeline Mowbray*, Hamilton's *Modern Philosophers*, and later Burney's *The Wanderer* struggle to keep Wollstonecraft at a distance, at the same time as using her feminist arguments to drive their social critique. As the century progresses, the way in which women writers approach these divisions becomes more sophisticated, turning criticism of transgressive female characters onto the sexual double standard which exempts men's behaviour from similar scrutiny. Although this is implicit in many of these texts, Austen's *Mansfield Park* confidently appropriates and naturalises Wollstonecraft's radical critique of social hypocrisy in order to attack the sexual mores of her post-revolutionary moment. Mary Shelley engages with her mother's personal and textual legacy to her by remoulding the female philosopher into more and more successful iterations, leading to her celebration of the figure melded with the widows, mothers and survivors of *Perkin Warbeck* and *Lodore*. Brontë's *Jane Eyre* forms part of this tradition by shedding the unhelpful connotations of the female philosopher figure, in both her ideal and nightmarish forms, in order to recreate her in Jane's plain, ordinary form. By shedding both Enlightenment and counter-revolutionary iterations of the female philosopher, Brontë allows her heroine to engage with Wollstonecraft's revolutionary feminist philosophy anew.

Indeed, in *Wollstonecraft's Ghost*, I have traced the manifold ways in which women writers make Wollstonecraft's life and writing freshly available both to themselves and new readers. Novelists from Mary Hays to Mary Shelley, and beyond, have celebrated her, distanced themselves from her, represented her as contrasting versions of the female philosopher, and moved beyond this stereotype in order to experiment with different modes of being. In these representations, Wollstonecraft appears as inspiration, warning, model, guide and ghost. The spirit of Wollstonecraft – complex, contradictory, challenging – infuses modern feminism in its celebration of female agency, critique of patriarchal oppression and searching exploration of representations of femininity and feminism itself.

Bibliography

Primary sources

- Addison, Joseph. *The Guardian*, 155 (Tuesday, 8 September 1713) anthologised in *The Works of the Late Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq.*, vol. 4 of 4, 2nd ed. London: Jacob Tonson, 1730, 231–233.
- [Anon]. *True Taste: or, Female Philosophy. Being an Epistle from Sylvia to Libertina*. London: Nutt et al., 1735.
- Austen, Jane. *Sense and Sensibility* (1811), ed. Edward Copeland. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Pride and Prejudice* (1813), ed. Pat Rogers. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Mansfield Park* (1814), ed. John Wiltshire. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Emma* (1815), eds. Richard Cronin and Dorothy McMillan. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Northanger Abbey* (1818), eds. Barbara Benedict and Deirdre Le Faye. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Austen, Jane. *Persuasion* (1818), eds. Janet Todd and Antje Blank. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 7. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. ‘Various Opinions of Mansfield Park’ in B.C. Southam, *Sense and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Mansfield Park Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1976, 200–205.
- Austen, Jane. *Juvenilia*, ed. Peter Sabor. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Austen, Jane. *Later Manuscripts*, ed. Brian Southam. *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 8. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Bage, Robert. *Hermesprong* (1796), eds. Donley T. Studlar and Pamela Perkins. Peterborough: Broadview, 2002.
- Barbauld, Anna Laetitia. *Remarks on Mr. Gilbert Wakefield’s ‘Enquiry into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship’*. London: Joseph Johnson, 1792.
- Barbauld, Anna Laetitia. *The Works of Anna Laetitia Barbauld, with a Memoir by Lucy Aiken*, ed. Lucy Aiken. vol. 1. London: Longman et al., 1825.

- Bennett, Agnes Maria. *Anna; or, Memoirs of a Welch Heiress*. London: William Lane, 1785.
- Betham, Matilda. *Biographical Dictionary of Celebrated Women of Every Age and Country*. London: B. Crosby, 1804.
- Blackstone, William. *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, vol. 1. London, 1765.
- Boyle, John, Earl of Orrery. *Remarks on the Life and Writings of Dr. Jonathan Swift*. Dublin: George Faulkner, 1752.
- Brontë, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre* (1847), ed. Stevie Davies. London: Penguin, 2003.
- Brunton, Mary. *Self Control*. Edinburgh: George Ramsay & Co., 1811.
- Brunton, Mary. *Discipline*. Edinburgh: George Ramsay & Co., 1814.
- Bulwer-Lytton, Edward. *Godolphin* (1833), ed. Harriet Jump Devine. *Silver Fork Novels, 1826–1841*, gen. ed. Harriet Jump Devine. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2005.
- Burke, Edmund. *Reflections on the Revolution in France* (1790), ed. L.G. Mitchell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Burney, Frances. *Evelina; or, The History of a Young Lady's Entrance into the World* (1778), eds. Vivien Jones and Edward A. Bloom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Burney, Frances. *Cecilia; or, Memoirs of an Heiress* (1782), eds. Peter Sabor and Margaret Anne Doody. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Burney, Frances. *Camilla; or Picture of Youth* (1796), eds. Edward A. Bloom and Lillian D. Bloom. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Burney, Frances. *The Wanderer; or, Female Difficulties* (1814), eds. Margaret Anne Doody, Robert L. Mack and Peter Sabor. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Cooper, Maria Susanna. *The Exemplary Mother; or, Letters between Mrs Villars and Her Family*, 2 vols. London: T. Becket, 1784.
- D.M., Rev. of Letters and Essays, by Mary Hays. *Analytical Review; or, History of Literature, Domestic and Foreign*, XVI. London: Johnson, 1793.
- Dacre, Charlotte. *Zofloya; or, the Moor* (1805), ed. Adriana Craciun. Peterborough: Broadview, 1997.
- De Staël, Madame. *Corinne, or Italy* (1807), trans. Sylvia Raphael. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Disraeli, Benjamin. *Vivian Grey*. London: Henry Colburn, 1826.
- Disraeli, Benjamin. *The Young Duke*. London: Henry Colburn, 1829.
- [Dorman, Joseph] *The Female Rake; or Modern Fine Lady. An Epistle from Libertina to Sylvia*. [London]: J. Wilford, 1735.
- [Du Bois, Edmund]. *St. Godwin: a Tale of the Sixteenth, Seventeenth, and Eighteenth Centuries by Reginald de St. Leon*, ed. Robert Miles and Sophia King, Waldorf; or, *The Dangers of Philosophy*, ed. Adriana Craciun. (*Anti-Jacobin Novels*, vol. 9) London: Pickering and Chatto, 2005.
- Edgeworth, Maria. *Practical Education* (1798), ed. Susan Manly. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2003.
- Edgeworth, Maria. *Castle Rackrent* (1800); *Irish Bulls* (1802); *Ennui* (1809), eds. Jane Desmarais, Tim McLoughlin and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1999.
- Edgeworth, Maria. *Belinda* (1801), ed. Siobhán Kilfeather. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 2. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2003.
- Edgeworth, Maria. *The Absentee* (1812); *Madame de Fleury* (1809); *Emilie de Coulanges* (1812), eds. Helen Van de Veire and Kim Walker, with Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 5. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1999.

- Edgeworth, Maria. *Patronage* (1814), eds. Conor Carville and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 6–7. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1999.
- Edgeworth, Maria. ‘Character and Writings of Mrs Elizabeth Hamilton’, *The Gentleman’s Magazine Supplement* 86. 2 (December, 1816), 623–624.
- Edgeworth, Maria. *Helen* (1834), eds. Susan Manly and Cliona Ó Gallchoir. *The Works of Maria Edgeworth*, vol. 9. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1999.
- [Enfield, William]. ‘Review of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’, *Monthly Review; or, Literary Examiner* 8 (May–June), London: Richard Griffiths, 1792, 198–209.
- Ferrier, Susan. *Marriage* (1818), ed. Herbert Foltinek. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Ferrier, Susan. *The Inheritance*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood, 1824.
- Ferrier, Susan. *Destiny; or, The Chief’s Daughter*. Edinburgh: Robert Cadell, 1831.
- Fordyce, David. *Dialogues Concerning Education*, 2 vols. London, [s.n.] 1745.
- Godwin, William. *An Enquiry Concerning Political Justice, and Its Influence on General Virtue and Happiness* (1793), ed. Mark Philp. *The Political and Philosophical Works of William Godwin*, vol. 3. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1993.
- Godwin, William. *Things As They Are; or, The Adventures of Caleb Williams* (1794), ed. Pamela Clemit. *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 3. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992.
- Godwin, William. *Memoirs of the Author of ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’* (1798), ed. Mark Philp. *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992.
- Godwin, William, ed. *Posthumous Works of the Author of ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’* (London: J. Johnson, 1798)
- Godwin, William. *St. Leon: A Tale of the Sixteenth Century* (1799), ed. Pamela Clemit. *Collected Novels and Memoirs of William Godwin*, vol. 4. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1992.
- Godwin, William. *Thoughts Occasioned by the Perusal of Dr Parr’s Spital Sermon, Preached at Christ Church, April 15, 100: Being a Reply to the Attacks of Dr Parr, Mr Mackintosh, the Author of an Essay on Population, and Others*. London: G.G. and J. Robinson, 1801.
- Godwin, William. *The Letters of William Godwin, Vol. 1: 1778–1797*, ed. Pamela Clemit. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Gore, Charlotte. *Mrs Armytage; or, Female Domination*. London: Henry Colbourn, 1836.
- Gore, Catherine. *Cecil; or, the Adventures of a Coxcomb* (London: Henry Colbourn, 1841).
- Gore, Catherine. *Cecil, A Peer* (London: Henry Colbourn, 1841).
- Griffith, Elizabeth. *The Delicate Distress, A Novel in Letters*, 2 vols. Dublin: Brett Smith, 1787.
- Griffith, Richard. *The Posthumous Works of a Late Celebrated Genius, Deceased*, 2 vols. London: W. and J. Robinson et al., 1770.
- Hamilton, Elizabeth. *Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* (1796), eds. Pamela Perkins and Shannon Russell. Peterborough: Broadview, 2004.
- Hamilton, Elizabeth. *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* (1800), ed. Claire Grogan. Peterborough: Broadview, 2000.
- Hamilton, Elizabeth. *The Cottagers of Glenburnie and Other Educational Writing* (1808), ed. Pam Perkins. Glasgow: Association of Scottish Literary Studies, 2010.
- Hays, Mary. *Cursory Remarks on ‘An Enquiry into the Expediency and Propriety of Public or Social Worship’*, 2nd ed. London: T. Knott, 1792.
- Hays, Mary. *Letters and Essays, Moral and Miscellaneous*. London: Knott, 1793.

- Hays, Mary. *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (1796), ed. Marilyn L. Brooks. Peterborough: Broadview, 2000.
- Hays, Mary. 'Review of Letters of a Hindoo Rajah'. *Analytical Review; or, History of Literature, Domestic and Foreign*, vol. 2. London: Johnson, 1796, 429–431.
- Hays, Mary. 'On Novel Writing', as M.H. *The Monthly Magazine* 4 (September 1797), 180–181.
- Hays, Mary. 'Letter to the Editor', *The Monthly Magazine* 4 (October 1797), 1.
- Hays, Mary. *Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of the Women*. London: J. Johnson, 1798.
- Hays, Mary. *The Victim of Prejudice* (1799), ed. Eleanor Ty. Peterborough: Broadview, 1996.
- Hays, Mary. 'Memoirs of Mary Wollstonecraft'. *Annual Necrology for 1797–1798*. London: Phillips, 1800.
- Hays, Mary. *Female Biography, or, Memoirs of Illustrious and Celebrated Women, of All Ages and Countries, Alphabetically Arranged*. 6 vols. London: Richard Phillips, 1803.
- Hays, Mary. *Memoirs of Queens, Illustrious and Celebrated*. London: T. and J. Allman, 1821.
- Hays, Mary. *The Correspondence of Mary Hays (1759–1843)*, *British Novelist*, ed. Marilyn L. Brooks. New York: Edwin Mellen Press, 2004.
- Hays, Mary. *The Idea of Being Free: A Mary Hays Reader*, ed. Gina Luria Walker. Peterborough: Broadview, 2006.
- Hazlitt, William. *A Letter to William Gifford, Esq.* (1819); *Lectures on the English Comic Writers* (1819); *Lectures on the Dramatic Literature of the Age of Elizabeth* (1820), ed. Duncan Wu. *Selected Writings of William Hazlitt*, vol. 5. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1998.
- Hazlitt, William. *Liber Amoris* (1823); *The Spirit of the Age* (1825), ed. Duncan Wu. *Selected Writings of William Hazlitt*, vol. 7. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1998.
- Hemans, Felicia. *Records of Women: With Other Poems*. Edinburgh: William Blackwood/London: T. Cadell, 1828.
- Holcroft, Thomas. *Anna St. Ives* (1792), ed. Wil Verhoeven. *The Novels and Selected Plays of Thomas Holcroft*, vol. 2. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2007.
- Inchbald, Elizabeth. *A Simple Story* (1791), ed. J.M.S. Tompkins. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.
- Inchbald, Elizabeth. *Nature and Art* (1796), ed. Shawn L. Maurer. Peterborough: Broadview, 2005.
- Inchbald, Elizabeth. *Lovers' Vows; A Play, in Five Acts; Altered from the German of Kotzebue* (1798) in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Jane Austen*, vol. 5, ed. John Wiltshire. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Johnson, Samuel. *The History of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia* (1759), ed. Thomas Keymer. Oxford: Oxford's World Classics, 2009.
- Landon, Laetitia Elizabeth. 'The Improvisatrice', in *The Improvisatrice and Other Poems*. London: Hurst, Robinson and Co., 1824, 1–105.
- Lennox, Charlotte. *The Female Quixote* (1752), ed. Margaret Dalziel. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Lewis, Matthew. *The Monk*, ed. Nick Groom (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016)
- Lloyd, Charles. *Edmund Oliver* (1798), ed. Philip Cox. *Anti-Jacobin Novels*, vol. 2, gen. ed. Wil Verhoeven. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2005.
- Lucas, Charles. *The Infernal Quixote: A Tale of the Day* (1801) in *Anti-Jacobin Novels*, vol. 10, gen. ed. Wil Verhoeven. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2005.
- Macaulay, Catharine. *Letters on Education* (1790). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Malkin, Benjamin Heath. *Essays on Subjects Connected with Civilization*. London: E. Hodson, 1795.
- More, Hannah. *Strictures on the Modern System of Female Education*. 2 vols. London: T. Cadell Jun. and W. Davies, 1799.
- More, Hannah. *Coelebs in Search of a Wife* (1809), ed. Patricia Demers. Peterborough: Broadview, 2007.
- Opie, Amelia. *Adeline Mowbray* (1805), ed. Anne McWhir. Peterborough: Broadview, 2010.
- ‘Original Sketch of Belinda: Abroad and at Home’ in Frances Edgeworth, *A Memoir of Maria Edgeworth, with A Selection from Her Letters*, vol. 3, 269–276. London: Joseph Masters and Son, 1867.
- Owenson, Sydney, Lady Morgan. *The Wild Irish Girl* (1806), ed. Kathryn J. Kirkpatrick. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Pilkington, Laetitia. *The Memoirs of Laetitia Pilkington, Wife to the Rev. Mr. Matth. Pilkington, Written by Herself*. Dublin, [s.n] 1748.
- Polwhele, Richard. *The Unsex’d Females: A Poem, Addressed to the Author of the Pursuits of Literature*. London: Cadell and Davies, 1798.
- Polwhele, Richard. *Anecdotes of Methodism*. London: Cadell and Davies, 1800.
- Price, Richard. *A Discourse on the Love of Our Country*. London: T. Cadell, 1790.
- Radcliffe, Mary Anne. *The Female Advocate; or, An Attempt to Recover the Rights of Women from Male Usurpation*. London: Vernor and Hood, 1799.
- Rev. of Adeline Mowbray, by Amelia Opie. *Monthly Review* 2nd series, 51 (Nov. 1806), 320–321.
- Rev. of Appeal to the Men of Great Britain in Behalf of the Women. *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 7. London: J. Plymsell, J. Whittle and C. Chapple, 1801.
- Rev. of A Vindication of the Rights of Woman, by Mary Wollstonecraft. *The Critical Review; or, Annals of Literature* 4. London: A. Hamilton, 1792, 389–398.
- Rev. of The Last Man, by Mary Shelley, *Literary Gazette* 474, (18 February 1826).
- Rev. of Letters and Essays, by Mary Hays, *The English Review; or, An Abstract of English and Foreign Literature* 22. London: Murray, 1793.
- Rev. of Memoirs of Emma Courtney, by Mary Hays, *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 3. London: J. Plymsell, J. Whittle and C. Chapple, 1799.
- Rev. of Memoirs of the Author of ‘A Vindication of the Rights of Woman’, by William Godwin, and Posthumous Works, ed. Godwin. *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 1. London: J. Plymsell, J. Whittle and C. Chapple, 1799.
- Rev. of St. Leon, by William Godwin. *The Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine; or, Monthly Political and Literary Censor* 5. London: J. Plymsell, J. Whittle and C. Chapple, 1800.
- Rev. of The Wanderer, by Frances Burney, *Critical Review*, 4th series, 5 (April 1814).
- Richardson, Samuel. *Clarissa* (1747), ed. Angus Ross. London: Penguin, 1985.
- Robinson, Mary. *A Letter to the Women of England* (1799), with *The Natural Daughter* (1799), ed. Sharon M. Setzer. Peterborough: Broadview, 2003.
- Robinson, Mary. *The Natural Daughter. With Portraits of the Leadenhead Family. A Novel* (1799). *The Works of Mary Robinson*, vol. 7, ed. Hester Davenport. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2010.
- Robinson, Mary. *Poems. The Works of Mary Robinson*, vol. 1, ed. Daniel Robinson. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2009.

- Scott, Sarah. *Millenium Hall* (1762), ed. Gary Kelly. Peterborough: Broadview, 1995.
- Scott, Walter. *Waverley* (1814), ed. P.D. Garside. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007.
- Scott, Walter. *Guy Mannering* (1815), ed. P.D. Garside. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1999.
- Scott, Walter. *Rob Roy* (1817), ed. David Hewitt. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008.
- Scott, Walter. *The Heart of Mid-Lothian* (1818), ed. Alison Lumsden and David Hewitt. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2004.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein* (1818), eds. D.L. Macdonald and Kathleen Scherf, 2nd ed. Peterborough: Broadview, 2005.
- Shelley, Mary. *Frankenstein* (1818), ed. Nora Crook. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *Valperga; or, The Life and Adventures of Castruccio, Prince of Lucca* (1823), ed. Nora Crook. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 3. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *The Last Man* (1826), ed. Jane Blumberg. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 4. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck* (1830), ed. Doucet Devin Fischer. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 5. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *Lodore* (1835), ed. Fiona Stafford. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 6. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *Falkner* (1837), ed. Pamela Clemit. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 7. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *Matilda* (1959), ed. Pamela Clemit. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 2. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Mary. *The Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley*, vol. 1–3, ed. Betty T. Bennett. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Shelley, Mary. *Collected Tales and Stories*, ed. Charles E. Robinson. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990.
- Shelley, Mary. *The Journals of Mary Shelley*, eds. Paula R. Feldman and Diana Scott-Kilvert. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Shelley, Mary. *Travel Writing*, ed. Jeanne Moskal. *The Novels and Selected Works of Mary Shelley*, vol. 8. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1996.
- Shelley, Percy Bysshe. 'England in 1819', 192, in *The Poems of Shelley*, vol. 3: 1819–20, eds. Jack Donovan et al. Harlow: Longman, 2011.
- Skelton, Philip. *Opiomaches; or, Deism Revealed*, 2 vols. London: A. Miller, 1751.
- Smyth, Maria. *The Woman of Letters; or, The History of Miss Fanny Belton*. London: Francis Noble, 1783.
- [Sophia, Lady Burrell]. *Adeline de Courcy*, 2 vols. London: T. Cadell and W. Davies, 1797.
- Wakefield, Priscilla. *Reflections on the Present Condition of the Female Sex: with Suggestions for its Improvement*. London: J. Johnson and Darton and Harvey, 1798.
- Walpole, Horace. *The Correspondence of Horace Walpole*, vol. 31. *Horace Walpole's Correspondence: Yale Edition* <<http://images.library.yale.edu/hwcorrespondence/page.asp?vol=31&page=397>> 4 October 2011.
- West, Jane. *A Tale of the Times* (1799) in *Anti-Jacobin Novels*, vol. 7, gen. ed. Wil Verhoeven. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2005.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Mary, A Fiction* (1788), eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.

- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Men* (1790), eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* (1792), eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 5. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Letters Written in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (1796), eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 6. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. 'Lessons' (1798) in *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 4. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *The Wrongs of Woman; or, Maria* (1798), eds. Janet Todd and Marilyn Butler. *The Works of Mary Wollstonecraft*, vol. 1. London: Pickering and Chatto, 1989.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *The Collected Letters of Mary Wollstonecraft*, ed. Janet Todd. London: Penguin, 2004.
- Wollstonecraft, Mary. *Original Stories from Real Life* (London: J. Johnson, 1788)

Secondary sources

- Acosta, Anna M. 'Spaces of Dissent and the Public Sphere in Hackney, Stoke Newington, and Newington Green'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27. 1 (Winter 2003), 1–27.
- Adams, M. Ray. 'Mary Hays, Disciple of William Godwin'. *PMLA* 55. 2 (June 1940), 472–483.
- Amis, Kingsley. 'What Became of Jane Austen?' in B.C. Southam, *Sense and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Mansfield Park Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1976, 243–246.
- Andrews, Stuart. *The British Periodical Press and the French Revolution*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2000.
- Armstrong, Nancy. *Desire and Domestic Fiction: A Political History of the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Atkinson, Colin B. and Jo Atkinson. 'Maria Edgeworth, Belinda, and Women's Rights'. *Eire-Ireland* 19 (1984), 94–118.
- Bailey, Elaine. 'Lexicography of the Feminine: Matilda Betham's Dictionary of Celebrated Women'. *Philological Quarterly* 83. 4 (Fall 2004), 289–313.
- Bann, Stephen, ed. *Frankenstein, Creation and Monstrosity*. London: Reaktion, 1994.
- Bannet, Eve Tavor. *The Domestic Revolution: Enlightenment Feminisms and the Novel*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Barrell, John. *The Spirit of Despotism: Invasions of Privacy in the 1790s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Beales, Derek and Eugenio Biagini. *The Risorgimento and the Unification of Italy* (1971), Harlow: Longman, 2002.
- Beaton, Roderick and David Ricks, eds. *The Making of Modern Greece: Nationalism, Romanticism and the Uses of the Past*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Bennett, Betty T. *Mary Wollstonecraft Shelley: An Introduction*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Bennett, Betty T. "'Not This Time, Victor!': Mary Shelley's Reversioning of Elizabeth, from Frankenstein to Falkner' in Betty T. Bennett and Stuart Curran, eds. *Mary Shelley in her Times*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000, 1–17.

- Bennett, Betty T. and Stuart Curran, eds. *Mary Shelley in her Times*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000.
- Bilger, Audrey. *Laughing Feminism: Subversive Comedy in Frances Burney, Maria Edgeworth and Jane Austen*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002.
- Binhammer, Katherine. 'The Persistence of Reading: Governing Female Novel-Reading in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* and *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 27. 2 (Spring 2003), 1–22.
- Binhammer, Katherine. *The Seduction Narrative in Britain, 1747–1800*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Botting, Fred. *Making Monstrous: Frankenstein, Criticism, Theory*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1991.
- Bray, Joe. *The Female Reader in the English Novel*. New York: Routledge, 2009.
- Brightwell, Cecilia Lucy. *Memorials of the Life of Amelia Opie*. London: Fletcher and Alexander, 1854.
- Broers, Michael. *Europe After Napoleon: Revolution, Reaction and Romanticism, 1814–1848*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1996.
- Brown, Lloyd W. 'Jane Austen and the Feminist Tradition'. *Nineteenth-Century Fiction* 28. 3 (December 1973), 321–338.
- Burns, Arthur and Joanna Innes, eds. *Rethinking the Age of Reform: Britain 1780–1850*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Buss, Helen M. et al., eds. *Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley: Writing Lives*. Peterborough: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001.
- Butler, Lisa. 'The Paradox of Effeminized Masculinity and the Crisis of Authorship'. *ESC* 31. 2–3 (June/September 2005), 79–98.
- Butler, Marilyn. *Maria Edgeworth: A Literary Biography*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.
- Butler, Marilyn. *Jane Austen and the War of Ideas* (1975). 2nd ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.
- Butler, Marilyn. 'Godwin, Burke and Caleb Williams'. *Essays in Criticism* 32. 3 (1982), 237–257.
- Cameron, Kenneth Neill, ed. *Romantic Rebels: Essays on Shelley and His Circle*, vol. 2. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1961.
- Carlson, Julie A. *England's First Family of Writers: Mary Wollstonecraft, William Godwin, Mary Shelley*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- Chandler, James. *England in 1819: The Politics of Literary Culture and the Case of Romantic Historicism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Clemit, Pamela. *The Godwinian Novel: The Rational Fictions of Godwin, Brockden Brown and Mary Shelley*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Clemit, Pamela. 'Frankenstein, Matilda, and the Legacies of Godwin and Wollstonecraft' in Esther M. Schor, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 26–44.
- Clemit, Pamela. 'Godwin, Political Justice' in Pamela Clemit ed. *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 86–100.
- Clemit, Pamela, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Clinton, Katherine B. 'Femme et Philosophe: Enlightenment Origins of Feminism'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 8. 3 (Spring 1975), 283–299.

- Coleman, Deirdre. 'Conspicuous Consumption: White Abolitionism and English Women's Protest Writing in the 1790s'. *ELH* 61. 2 (1984), 341–362.
- Copeland, Edward. 'Crossing Oxford Street: Silverfork Geopolitics'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 25. 2 (2001): 116–134.
- Copeland, Edward. *The Silver Fork Novel: Fashionable Fiction in the Age of Reform*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- Cordon, Joanne. 'Revising Stereotypes of Nationality and Gender: Why Maria Edgeworth Did Not Write *Castle Belinda*' in Julie Nash, ed. *New Essays on Maria Edgeworth*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 131–160.
- Craciun, Adriana. *Fatal Women of Romanticism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Craciun, Adriana. *British Women Writers and the French Revolution: Citizens of the World*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Craciun, Adriana and Kari E. Lokke. *Rebellious Hearts: British Women Writers and the French Revolution*. New York: SUNY Press, 2001.
- Cronin, Richard, ed. *1798: The Year of the Lyrical Ballads*. London: Macmillan, 1998.
- Cross, Ashley J. 'He-She Philosophers and Other Literary Bugbears: Mary Robinson's A Letter to the Women of England'. *Women's Writing* 9. 1 (2002), 53–68.
- Curran, Stuart. 'Valperga' in Esther M. Schor, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 103–115.
- Davidoff, Leonore and Catherine Hall. *Family Fortunes: Men and Women of the English Middle Class, 1780–1850*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Davison, Carol Margaret. 'Getting Their Knickers in a Twist: Contesting the Female Gothic in Charlotte Dacre's *Zofloya*'. *Gothic Studies* 11. 1 (May, 2009), 32–45.
- Dickinson, H.T. 'The Political Context' in Pamela Clemit ed. *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 1–15.
- Diedrick, James. 'Jane Eyre and A Vindication of the Rights of Woman' in *Approaches to Teaching Brontë's 'Jane Eyre'*, eds. Diane Long Hoeveler and Beth Lau. New York: MLA, 1993, 22–28.
- Dobson, Michael. *The Making of the National Poet: Shakespeare, Adaptation, and Authorship, 1660–1769*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Doody, Margaret Anne. *Frances Burney: The Life in the Works*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.
- Dorr, Priscilla. 'Elizabeth Carter (1717–1806)'. *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 5. 1 (Spring 1986), 138–140.
- Drescher, Seymour. *Capitalism and Antislavery*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- Dunn, James A. 'Charlotte Dacre and the Feminization of Violence'. *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 53. 3 (December, 1998), 307–327.
- Earland, Ada. *John Opie and His Circle*. London: Hutchinson & Co., 1911.
- Eberle, Roxanne. 'Amelia Opie's Adeline Mowbray: Diverting the Libertine Gaze; or, the Vindication of a Fallen Woman'. *Studies in the Novel* 26 (1994), 121–152.
- Eberle, Roxanne. *Chastity and Transgression in Women's Writing, 1792–1897: Interrupting the Harlot's Progress*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Egenolf, Susan B. *The Art of Political Fiction in Hamilton, Edgeworth and Owenson*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Eger, Elizabeth, et al., eds. *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700–1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- Eger, Elizabeth. *Bluestockings: Women of Reason from Enlightenment to Romanticism*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
- Ellis, Kate Ferguson. 'Subversive Surfaces: The Limits of Domestic Affections in Mary Shelley's Later Fictions' in Audrey A. Fisch et al., *The Other Mary Shelley: Beyond 'Frankenstein'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993, 220–234.
- Ellis, Kate Ferguson. 'Falkner and Other Fictions' in Esther M. Schor, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 151–162.
- Favret, Mary. *Romantic Correspondence: Women, Politics and the Fiction of Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Favret, Mary. *War at a Distance: Romanticism and the Making of Modern War Time*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Fergus, Jan. 'Women Readers: A Case Study' in *Women and Literature in Britain, 1700–1800*, ed. Vivien Jones. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000, 155–176.
- Ferguson, Moira. *Subject to Others: British Women Writers and Colonial Slavery, 1670–1834*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Ferris, Ina. *The Achievement of Literary Authority: Gender, History and the Waverley Novels*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1991.
- Ferris, Ina. *The Romantic National Tale and the Question of Ireland*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Fisch, Audrey A. et al. *The Other Mary Shelley: Beyond 'Frankenstein'*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Garbin, Lidia. 'The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck: Walter Scott in the Writings of Mary Shelley' *Romanticism on the Net* 6 (May 1997) <<http://www.erudit.org/revue/RON/1997/v/n6/005752ar.html>> 5 September 2012.
- Gaskin, J.C.A. 'Hume on Religion' in *The Cambridge Companion to David Hume*, ed. David Fate Norton. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 313–344.
- Gay, Penny. *Jane Austen and the Theatre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Gilbert, Sandra M. and Susan Gubar. *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (1979). Yale: Yale Nota Bene, 2000.
- Gilmartin, Kevin. *Writing Against Revolution: Literary Conservatism, 1790–1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Golightly, Jennifer. 'Where in The Wanderer is Wollstonecraft? Radicalism, Feminism, and Jacobinism in 1814'. Unpublished paper delivered at ASECS Annual Meeting, Albuquerque, USA, 18 March 2010.
- Goodman, Dena. 'Enlightenment Salons: The Convergence of Female and Philosophic Ambitions'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 22. 3 (Spring 1989), 329–350.
- Gordon, Lyndall. *Vindication: A Life of Mary Wollstonecraft*. London: HarperCollins, 2005.
- Green, Karen. 'The Passions and the Imagination in Wollstonecraft's Theory of Moral Judgement'. *Utilitas* 9 (1997), 271–290.
- Greenfield, Susan C. "'Abroad and at Home": Sexual Ambiguity, Miscegenation, and Colonial Boundaries in Edgeworth's *Belinda*'. *PMLA* 112. 2 (March 1997), 214–228.
- Greenfield, Susan C. *Mothering Daughters: Novels and the Politics of Family Romance: Frances Burney to Jane Austen*. Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002.
- Grenby, Matthew. *The Anti-Jacobin Novel: British Conservatism and the French Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

- Griffin, Dustin. *Regaining Paradise: Milton and the Eighteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Grogan, Claire. 'Introduction' to *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*, 9–26. Ontario: Broadview, 2000.
- Grogan, Claire. 'Identifying Foreign Bodies: New Philosophers and Hottentots in Elizabeth Hamilton's *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*'. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 18. 3 (Spring 2006), 305–327.
- Gutwirth, Madelyn. 'Taking Corinne Seriously: A Comment on Ellen Moers's *Literary Women*'. *Signs: Journal of Women in Society*, 25 (2000), 895–899.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Enquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society* (1989), trans. Thomas Burger, with Frederick Lawrence. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1991.
- Handwerk, Gary. 'History, Trauma, and the Limits of the Liberal Imagination' in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*, eds. Tilottama Rajan and Julia Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 64–85.
- Hanley, Kirstin. "'A New Servitude': Pedagogy and Feminist Practice in Brontë's Jane Eyre'. *Nineteenth-Century Gender Studies* 5. 3 (Winter 2009) <<http://www.ncgsjournal.com/issue53/hanley.htm>> 28 September 2011.
- Harvey, Alison. "'West Indian Obeah and English 'Obee'": Race, Femininity, and the Question of Colonial Consolidation in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*' in Julie Nash, ed. *New Essays on Maria Edgeworth*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 1–29.
- Haslett, Moyra. 'Bluestocking Feminism Revisited: The Satirical Figure of the Bluestocking'. *Women's Writing* 17. 3 (Dec. 2010), 432–451.
- Haywood, Ian. *The Revolution in Popular Literature: Print, Politics, and the People, 1790–1860*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Heller, Deborah. 'Bluestocking Salons and the Public Sphere'. *Eighteenth-Century Life* 22. 2 (1998), 59–82.
- Hill-Miller, Katherine C. *'My Hideous Progeny': Mary Shelley, William Godwin and the Father-Daughter Relationship*. Delaware: University of Delaware Press, 1995.
- Hodson, Jane. "'The Strongest But Most Undecorated Language": Robinson's Rhetorical Strategy in Letter to the Women of England', *Women's Writing* 9. 1 (2002), 87–105.
- Hodson, Jane. *Language and Revolution in Burke, Wollstonecraft, Paine, and Godwin*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Hodson, Jane. 'Women Write the Rights of Women: The Sexual Politics of the Personal Pronoun in the 1790s' *Language and Literature* 16. 3 (2007), 281–304.
- Hoeveler, Diane. 'Vindicating Northanger Abbey: Mary Wollstonecraft, Jane Austen, and Gothic Feminism' in *Jane Austen and the Discourses of Feminism*, ed. Devoney Looser. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 1995, 117–136.
- Hughes, Winifred. 'Silver Fork Writers and Readers: Social Contexts of a Best Seller'. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 25. 3 (Spring 1992), 328–347.
- Hughes, Winifred. 'Elegies for the Regency: Catherine Gore's Dandy Novels' *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 50. 2 (1995), 189–209.
- Jacobus, Mary. 'Intimate Connections: Scandalous Memoirs and Epistolary Indiscretion' in Elizabeth Eger, et al., eds. *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700–1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 274–289.
- Janes, R.M. 'On the Reception of Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*'. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 39. 2 (April–June 1978), 293–302.
- Johnson, Claudia L., ed. *Jane Austen: Women, Politics, and the Novel*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990.

- Johnson, Claudia L., ed. *Equivocal Beings: Politics, Gender and Sentimentality in the 1790s*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.
- Johnson, Claudia L., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Johnson, Claudia L. and Clara Tuite, eds. *A Companion to Jane Austen*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing, 2009.
- Johnson, Nancy E. 'Wollstonecraft and Godwin: Dialogues' in Pamela Clemit ed. *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 101–116.
- Jones, Vivien. "'The Tyranny of the Passions': Feminism and Heterosexuality in the Fiction of Wollstonecraft and Hays' in *Political Gender: Texts and Contexts*, eds. Sally Ledger, Josephine McDonagh and Jane Spencer. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994, 173–188.
- Jones, Vivien. 'The Death of Mary Wollstonecraft'. *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 20. 2 (Autumn 1997), 187–205.
- Jones, Vivien. 'Placing Jemima: Women Writers of the 1790s and the Eighteenth-Century Prostitution Narrative'. *Women's Writing* 4.2 (1997), 201–220.
- Jones, Vivien. 'Post-feminist Austen'. *Critical Quarterly* 52. 4 (December 2010), 65–82.
- Jump, Harriet, ed. *Lives of the Great Romantics III: Godwin, Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley by Their Contemporaries, Vol. 2: Wollstonecraft*. London: Pickering & Chatto, 1999.
- Kelly, Gary. *The English Jacobin Novel, 1780–1805*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Kelly, Gary. *Women, Writing and Revolution 1790–1827*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Kendra, April. 'Gendering the Silver Fork: Catherine Gore and the Society Novel'. *Women's Writing* 11. 1 (2004), 25–38.
- Kirkham, Margaret. *Jane Austen, Feminism and Fiction*. London: The Athlone Press, 1997.
- Kirkpatrick, Kathryn. "'Gentlemen Have Horrors Upon the Subject': West Indian Suitors in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*'. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 5. 4 (July 1993), 331–348.
- Klancher, Jon P. *The Making of English Reading Audiences, 1790–1832*. Wisconsin: University of Wisconsin Press, 1987.
- Knoepflmacher, U.C. 'Thoughts on the Aggression of Daughters' in George Levine and U.C. Knoepflmacher, eds. *The Endurance of 'Frankenstein': Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, 88–119.
- Knott, Sarah and Barbara Taylor, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
- Knox-Shaw, Peter. 'Sense and Sensibility, Godwin and the Empiricists'. *Cambridge Quarterly* 27.3 (1998), 183–208.
- Knox-Shaw, Peter. *Jane Austen and the Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Kowaleski-Wallace, Elizabeth. *Their Fathers' Daughters: Hannah More, Maria Edgeworth and Patriarchal Complicity*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Kucich, Greg. 'Women's Historiography and the (Dis)embodiment of Law: Ann Yearsley, Mary Hays, Elizabeth Benger'. *Wordsworth Circle* 33 (2002), 2–7.
- Landes, Joan B. 'The Public and the Private Sphere: A Feminist Reconsideration' in *Feminists Read Habermas: Gendering the Subject of Discourse*, ed. Johanna Meehan. New York: Routledge, 1993, 91–116.
- Landry, Donna. 'Learning to Ride at Mansfield Park' in You-me Park and Sunder Rajan Rajeswari, eds. *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004, 56–73.

- Langbauer, Laurie. 'An Early Romance: Motherhood and Women's Writing in Mary Wollstonecraft's Novels' in Anne Mellor, ed. *Romanticism and Feminism*, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1988, 208–219.
- Laven, David and Lucy Riall, eds. *Napoleon's Legacy: The Problem of Government in Restoration Europe*. Oxford: Berg, 2000.
- Leask, Nigel. *British Romantic Writers and the East: Anxieties of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Levine, George and U.C. Knoepfelmacher, eds. *The Endurance of Frankenstein: Essays on Mary Shelley's Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Lokke, Kari E. 'The Last Man' in Esther M. Schor, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 116–134.
- Lokke, Kari E. *Tracing Women's Romanticism: Gender, History and Transcendence*. Oxon: Routledge, 2004.
- Lynch, Deidre. 'Historical Novelist' in Esther M. Schor, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004, 135–150.
- McCann, Andrew. 'Conjugal Love and the Enlightenment Subject: The Colonial Context of Non-Identity in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*'. *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction* 30. 1 (Autumn 1996), 56–77.
- Macdonald, D.L. and Kathleen Scherf. 'Introduction', *Frankenstein: The Original 1818 Text*, 2nd ed. Peterborough: Broadview, 2005, 11–38.
- McInnes, Andrew. 'Beauties and Beasts: Alderson, Wollstonecraft, Godwin, Opie'. *Royal Institution of Cornwall Journal* (2009), 41–50.
- McInnes, Andrew. 'Feminism in the Footnotes: Wollstonecraft's Ghost in Mary Hays' *Female Biography*'. *Life Writing* 8. 3 (September 2011), 273–285.
- McInnes, Andrew. 'Wollstonecraft's Legion: Feminism in Crisis, 1799'. *Women's Writing* 20. 4 (November 2013), 479–495.
- McInnes, Andrew. 'Amazonian Fashions: Lady Delacour's (Re)Dress in Maria Edgeworth's *Belinda*' in F.M. Scott, Kate Scarth and Ji-Won Chung, eds. *Picturing Women's Health*. London: Pickering and Chatto, 2014, 29–44.
- McInnes, Andrew. "'Better Known as Rosa Matilda": Charlotte Dacre's Authorial Doppelganger' in Maria Purves, ed. *Women & Gothic*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2014, 97–112.
- McKee, Patricia. *Public & Private: Gender, Class and the British Novel (1764–1878)*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997.
- McKeon, Michael. *The Secret History of Domesticity: Public, Private and the Division of Knowledge*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2007.
- McWhir, Anne. 'Introduction' to *Adeline Mowbray*. Ontario: Broadview, 2010, 9–34.
- Marshall, Peter H. *William Godwin*. Yale University Press, 1984.
- Marshall, Peter James. *The Impeachment of Warren Hastings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- May, Leila Silvana. 'The Strong-Arming of Desire: A Reconsideration of Nancy Armstrong's *Desire and Domestic Fiction*'. *ELH* 68. 1 (Spring 2001), 267–285.
- Mee, Jon. 'Austen's Treacherous Ivory: Female Patriotism, Domestic Ideology, and Empire' in You-me Park and Sunder Rajan Rajeswari, eds. *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004, 74–92.
- Mellor, Anne, ed. *Romanticism and Feminism*, ed. Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1988.
- Mellor, Anne K. *Mary Shelley: Her Life, Her Fiction, Her Monsters*. London: Routledge, 1989.

- Mellor, Anne K. *Romanticism and Gender*. New York: Routledge, 1993.
- Mellor, Anne K. “‘Am I Not a Woman, and a Sister?’: Slavery, Romanticism, and Gender” in Alan Richardson and Sonia Hofkosh, eds. *Romanticism, Race, and Imperial Culture, 1780–1834*. Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1996, 311–329.
- Mellor, Anne K. *Mothers of the Nation: Women’s Political Writing in England, 1780–1830*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2000.
- Mellor, Anne K. ‘Were Women Writers “Romantics”?’ *Modern Language Quarterly* 62. 4 (December 2001), 393–405.
- Mellor, Anne K. ‘Mary Wollstonecraft’s A Vindication of the Rights of Woman and the Women Writers of her Day’ in Claudia L. Johnson, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 141–159.
- Moers, Ellen. *Literary Women*. New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Moers, Ellen. ‘The Female Gothic’ in George Levine and U.C. Knoepfelmacher, eds. *The Endurance of ‘Frankenstein’: Essays on Mary Shelley’s Novel*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979, 77–87.
- Monnickendam, Andrew. ‘The Scottish National Tale’ in Murray Pittock, ed. *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Romanticism*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2011, 100–111.
- Monsam, Angela. ‘Biography as Autopsy in William Godwin’s Memoirs of the Author of “A Vindication of the Rights of Woman”’. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 21. 1 (Fall 2008), 109–130.
- Mulvey-Roberts, Marie. ‘The Corpse in the Corpus: Frankenstein, Rewriting Wollstonecraft and the Abject’ in Michael Eberle-Sinatra and Nora Crook, eds. *Mary Shelley’s Fictions: From ‘Frankenstein’ to ‘Falkner’*. Basingstoke: Macmillan, 2000, 197–210.
- Myers, Mitzi. ‘Godwin’s Memoirs of Wollstonecraft: The Shaping of Self and Subject’. *Studies in Romanticism* 20. 3 (Fall 1981), 299–316.
- Myers, Mitzi. ‘Reform or Ruin: “A Revolution in Female Manners”’. *Studies in Eighteenth-Century Culture* 11 (1982), 199–216.
- Nachumi, Nora. *Acting Like A Lady: British Women Novelists and the Eighteenth-Century Theater*. New York: AMS Press, 2008.
- Nash, Julie. “‘Standing in Distress Between Tragedy and Comedy’: Servants in Maria Edgeworth’s *Belinda*’ in Julie Nash, ed. *New Essays on Maria Edgeworth*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 161–174.
- Nash, Julie, ed. *New Essays on Maria Edgeworth*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Nash, Julie. *Servants and Paternalism in the Works of Maria Edgeworth and Elizabeth Gaskell*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007.
- Nowka, Scott A. ‘Materialism and Feminism in Mary Hays’s Memoirs of Emma Courtney’. *European Romantic Review* 18. 4 (2007), 521–540.
- Nussbaum, Felicity. *Torrid Zones: Maternity, Sexuality and Empire in Eighteenth-Century English Narratives*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1995.
- Ó Gallchoir, Cliona. *Maria Edgeworth: Women, Enlightenment and Nation*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press, 2005.
- Park, You-me and Rajeswari Sunder Rajan, eds. *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004.
- Paul, C. Kegan. *William Godwin: His Friends and Contemporaries* (1876). 2 vols. New York: AMC Press, 1970.
- Pearson, Jacqueline. *Women’s Reading in Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Philp, Mark. *Godwin’s Political Justice*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1986.

- Philp, Mark, ed. *The French Revolution and British Popular Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Poovey, Mary. *The Proper Lady and the Woman Writer: Ideology as Style in the Works of Mary Wollstonecraft, Mary Shelley, and Jane Austen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- Rajan, Tilottama. 'Wollstonecraft and Godwin: Reading the Secrets of the Political Novel'. *Studies in Romanticism* 27 (1988), 221–251.
- Rajan, Tilottama. 'Between Romance and History: Possibility and Contingency in Godwin, Leibniz, and Mary Shelley's *Valperga*' in Betty T. Bennett and Stuart Curran, eds. *Mary Shelley in her Times*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000, 247–250.
- Rajan, Tilottama. 'Autonarration and Genotext in Mary Hays' *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*' in *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*, eds. Rajan and Julia Wright (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 213–239.
- Rajan, Tilottama and Julia Wright, eds. *Romanticism, History, and the Possibilities of Genre*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Rendall, Jane. 'Wollstonecraft, Vindications and Historical and Moral View of the French Revolution' in Pamela Clemit ed. *The Cambridge Companion to British Literature of the French Revolution in the 1790s*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011, 71–85.
- Robertson, Fiona. *Legitimate Histories: Scott, Gothic, and the Authorities of Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994.
- Robertson, John. 'Women and Enlightenment: A Historiographical Conclusion', in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 692–704.
- Robinson, Charles E. 'A Mother's Daughter: An Intersection of Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein* and Mary Wollstonecraft's *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*' in Helen M. Buss et al., eds. *Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley: Writing Lives*. Peterborough: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001, 127–138.
- Rogers, Katharine M. *Frances Burney: The World of 'Female Difficulties'*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1990.
- Ross, Marlon. *The Contours of Masculine Desire: Romanticism and the Rise of Women's Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Said, Edward W. *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage, 2007.
- Schoina, Maria. *Romantic 'Anglo-Italians': Configurations of Identity in Byron, the Shelleys and the Pisan Circle*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009.
- Schor, Esther M., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Shelley*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Showalter, Elaine. *A Literature of Their Own: British Women Novelists from Brontë to Lessing*. London: Virago, 1978.
- Soper, Kate. 'Feminism and Enlightenment Legacies' in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 705–715.
- Southam, B.C. *Sense and Sensibility, Pride and Prejudice and Mansfield Park Casebook*. London: Macmillan, 1976.
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer. 'Energies of Mind: Plot's Possibilities in the 1790s' *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 1. 1 (October 1988), 37–52.
- Spencer, Jane. 'Of Use to Her Daughter: Maternal Authority and Early Women Novelists' in Dale Spender, ed. *Living By the Pen: Early British Women Novelists*. Columbia: Columbia University Press, 1992.

- Spencer, Jane. *The Rise of the Woman Novelist: from Aphra Behn to Jane Austen* (1986). Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1993.
- Spencer, Jane. *Aphra Behn's Afterlife*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Spencer, Jane. *Literary Relations: Kinship and the Canon, 1660–1830*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Spencer, Jane. 'Narrative Technique: Austen and Her Contemporaries' in Claudia L. Johnson and Clara Tuite, eds. *A Companion to Jane Austen*. Chichester: Blackwell Publishing, 2009, 185–194.
- Sperber, Jonathan. *The European Revolutions, 1848–1851*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Sperber, Jonathan. *Revolutionary Europe, 1780–1850*. Harlow: Longman, 2000.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. 'Three Women's Texts and a Critique of Imperialism'. *Critical Inquiry* 12. 1 (Autumn 1985), 243–261.
- Spongberg, Mary. *Writing Women's History since the Renaissance*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002.
- St Clair, William. *The Godwins and the Shelleys: The Biography of a Family*. London: Faber and Faber, 1990.
- St Clair, William. *The Reading Nation in the Romantic Period*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Stephenson, Glennis. 'Laetitia Landon and the Victorian Improvisatrice: The Construction of L.E.L.' *Victorian Poetry* 30 (Spring 1992), 1–17.
- Tauchert, Ashley. *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Accent of the Feminine*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
- Taylor, Barbara. 'The Religious Foundations of Mary Wollstonecraft's Feminism' in Claudia L. Johnson, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Mary Wollstonecraft*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002, 99–118.
- Taylor, Barbara. *Mary Wollstonecraft and the Feminist Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Taylor, Barbara. 'Feminists versus Gallants: Manners and Morals in Enlightenment Britain' in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 30–52.
- Thomas, Claudia. *Alexander Pope and His Eighteenth-Century Women Readers*. Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1994.
- Thompson, E.P. *The Making of the English Working Class* (1963). London: Penguin, 1991.
- Todd, Janet. *Gender, Art and Death*. London: Polity, 1993.
- Todd, Janet. *Mary Wollstonecraft: A Revolutionary Life*. London: Phoenix, 2001.
- Todd, Janet. *Death and the Maidens: Fanny Wollstonecraft and the Shelley Circle*. London: Profile, 2008.
- Tomalin, Claire. *The Life and Death of Mary Wollstonecraft* (1974). London: Penguin, 2004.
- Tomaselli, Sylvana. 'The Most Public Sphere of All: The Family' in Elizabeth Eger, et al., eds. *Women, Writing and the Public Sphere, 1700–1830*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001, 239–256.
- Trott, Nicola. 'Sexing the Critic: Mary Wollstonecraft at the Turn of the Century' in Richard Cronin, ed. *1798: The Year of the Lyrical Ballads*. London: Macmillan, 1998, 32–67.
- Trumpener, Katie. *Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the British Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.

- Tuite, Clara. *Romantic Austen: Sexual Politics and the Literary Canon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Tuite, Clara. 'Domestic Retrenchment and Imperial Expansion: The Property Plots of Mansfield Park' in You-me Park, and Sunder Rajan Rajeswari, eds. *The Postcolonial Jane Austen*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2004, 93–115.
- Ty, Eleanor. *Unsex'd Revolutionaries: Five Women Novelists of the 1790s*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993.
- Ty, Eleanor. *Empowering the Feminine: The Narratives of Mary Robinson, Jane West and Amelia Opie, 1796–1812*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.
- Vargo, Lisa. 'Further Thoughts on the Education of Daughters: Lodore as an Imagined Conversation with Mary Wollstonecraft' in Helen M. Buss et al., eds. *Mary Wollstonecraft and Mary Shelley: Writing Lives*. Peterborough: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2001, 177–188.
- Waldron, Mary. *Jane Austen and the Fiction of Her Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Walker, Gina Luria. *Mary Hays (1759–1843): The Growth of a Woman's Mind*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006.
- Walker, Gina Luria. 'Mary Hays (1759–1843): An Enlightened Quest' in Sarah Knott and Barbara Taylor, eds. *Women, Gender and Enlightenment*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007, 493–518.
- Walker, Gina Luria. 'The Two Marys: Hays Writes Wollstonecraft' in *Called to Civil Existence: Mary Wollstonecraft's The Rights of Woman*, ed. Enit K. Steiner (Amsterdam: Rodolphi Press, 2014), 49–70.
- Wallace, Diana and Andrew Smith, eds. *The Female Gothic: New Directions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Wallace, Miriam L. 'Mary Hays's Female Philosopher: Constructing Revolutionary Subjects in Memoirs of Emma Courtney' in Adriana Craciun and Kari E. Lokke, eds. *Rebellious Hearts: British Women Writers and the French Revolution*. New York: SUNY Press, 2001, 233–260.
- Wallace, Miriam L. *Revolutionary Subjects in the English 'Jacobin' Novel*. Lewisburg: Bucknell University Press, 2009.
- Wallace, Miriam L. 'Writing Lives and Gendering History in Mary Hays' Female Biography (1803)' in Eugene Stelzig, ed. *Romantic Autobiography in England*. Farnham: Ashgate, 2009, 63–78.
- Wallace, Tara Ghoshal. 'Self and Text: Wollstonecraft in Burney's The Wanderer'. Unpublished paper delivered at ASECS Annual Meeting 2010, Albuquerque, USA, 18 March 2010.
- Waters, Mary A. '"The First of a New Genus": Mary Wollstonecraft as a Literary Critic and Mentor to Mary Hays'. *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37. 3 (2004), 415–434.
- Watt, James. *Contesting the Gothic: Fiction, Genre, and Cultural Conflict, 1764–1832*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Webb, Samantha. 'Reading the End of the World: The Last Man, History and the Agency of Romantic Authorship' in Betty T. Bennett and Stuart Curran, eds. *Mary Shelley in her Times*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000, 119–134.
- Weiss, Deborah. 'The Extraordinary Ordinary Belinda: Maria Edgeworth's Female Philosopher'. *Eighteenth-Century Fiction* 19. 4 (Summer 2007), 441–461.
- Welsh, Alexander. *The Hero of the Waverley Novels*. Yale University Press, 1963.
- Weston, Rowland. 'William Godwin's Religious Sense'. *British Journal for Eighteenth-Century Studies* 32. 3 (2009), 407–423.

- White, Daniel E. *Early Romanticism and Religious Dissent*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Williams, Eric. *Capitalism and Slavery*. London: André Deutsch, 1944.
- Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Wilt, Judith. *Secret Leaves: The Novels of Walter Scott*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1985.
- Wolfson, Susan. *Borderlines: The Shiftings of Gender in British Romanticism*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2006.
- Wood, Jeanne. “‘Alphabetically Arranged’: Mary Hays’ Female Biography and the Biographical Dictionary”. *Genre: Forms of Discourse and Culture* 31. 2 (Summer 1998), 117–142.
- Wright, Angela. ‘Disturbing the Female Gothic: An Excavation of the Northanger Novels’ in Diana Wallace and Andrew Smith, eds. *Female Gothic: New Directions*. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2009, 66–75.
- Wyett, Jodi. ‘Re-making Mary: Figuring “Female Difficulties” in Frances Burney’s *The Wanderer*’. Unpublished paper delivered at ASECS Annual Meeting 2010, Albuquerque, USA, 18 March 2010.
- Zonana, Joyce. “‘They Will Prove the Truth of My Tale’: Safie’s Letters as the Feminist Core of Mary Shelley’s *Frankenstein*’. *Journal of Narrative Technique* 21. 2 (Spring 1991), 170–184.

Index

- abolition movement 100
Addison, Joseph 9
Adeline de Courcy 12–13
Adeline Mowbray (Opie): as critique of the status quo 66, 70–1; dangers of female reading 76; as feminist novel 65–6; feminist space in 74–5; marriage, institution of 69–70, 71–4; narrative structure 75; social hypocrisy in 70–1; theory/practice interplay 67–9, 75
Anti-Jacobin Review and Magazine: feminisation of Wollstonecraft 23; loyalism of 64, 99; review of *Maria* 61–2; review of *Memoirs* (Godwin) 62; review of *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* 35–6; review of *St Leon* 49; review of *Vindication* 6
Austen, Jane: celebration of the novel 16–17; engagement with the historical moment 100, 101; *Northanger Abbey* 16; as Post-Jacobin author 101; *Sense and Sensibility* 101; Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in 98, 115–16; see also *Mansfield Park*
authors: engagement with the historical moment 99–100; self-presentation of 24, 25–6

Barbauld, Anna Laetitia 12, 99–100
Belinda (Edgeworth): creation of the ideal women 94–5; dangers of radical politics without systematic thought 89–91; discussion of Creole women 91; on female delicacy 89–90; female education 94–5; female nature versus artifice 92–3, 94; female philosopher figure in 87–8, 93–4; focus on act of reading 88–9, 95; Lady Delacour as Godwinian mentor 92–3, 94; metatextuality of 88–9, 95–6

Bennett, Betty 154, 156
Binhammer, Katherine 81, 83
bluestocking philosophy 7–8
Bray, Joe 18
Brightwell, Cecilia 66–7
Brontë, Charlotte *see Jane Eyre*
Brooks, Marilyn 34
Brunton, Mary 99
Bulwer-Lytton, Edward 134, 160
Burke, Edmund 3–4, 64–5, 90
Burney, Frances: association with Elizabeth Montagu 8; engagement with the historical moment 100, 101; Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in 98; see also *The Wanderer*
Butler, Marilyn 29, 63, 101

capitalism 15, 38
Carter, Elizabeth 8
Clemit, Pamela 55–6
Copeland, Edward 159–60, 167
Craciun, Adriana 2, 136, 142, 143
Critical Review 5
Crocker, John Wilson 100

Dacre, Charlotte 134, 136
Davison, Carol Margaret 137
Deism Revealed (Skelton) 10
Disraeli, Benjamin 159, 160
domestic sphere: effect of Wollstonecraft on political philosophy of 47, 48–9; Godwin's reassessment of 40–2, 157; Habermas on 38; return to by heroines 173; *see also* private sphere
Doody, Margaret Anne 102–3, 106, 110
Dunn, James A. 136, 143

Earland, Ada 72
Eberle, Roxanne 66, 74

- Edgeworth, Maria: obituary of Elizabeth Hamilton 86, 87; *Patronage* 99; political position of 62, 63–4; review of *Memoirs* (Hamilton) 86; Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in 61, 63, 64, 96–7
- education: in *Belinda* 94–5; and the creature, *Frankenstein* 138–40; in *Jane Eyre* 170; in *Lodore* 161–2, 163, 165; in *Mansfield Park* 116, 118–19, 120–1, 124, 130; in *Mrs Armytage* 162, 166; in, *Perkin Warbeck* 158; for social dependence of women 34; *Thoughts on the Education of Daughters* (Wollstonecraft) 138; in *Valperga* 149; in *Vindication* 5, 116, 120; and women's role in civic society 7
- Egenolf, Susan 88, 96
- Eger, Elizabeth 7
- Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* (Barbauld) 99–100
- Enfield, William 4–5, 12
- The English Review* 28
- Europe: 1814, literary and historical significance of 98–9; in the 1820s and 1830s 132–3, 156–7; *Eighteen Hundred and Eleven* (Barbauld) 99–100; French Revolution 11, 18–19; Napoleonic Wars 99, 104, 156; resurgence of autocratic regimes 156–7
- the family: patriarchal authority in 15; subjectivities of conjugal families 14–15, 38
- Female Gothic 133–4, 136, 137
- female philosophers: bluestocking philosophy and 7–8; as contested term 2–3, 28; defining characteristics of 8, 10; divided representations of 23, 169; elision of with Mary Wollstonecraft 2; Enlightenment ideals of 8, 12, 13, 169; figure of, eighteenth-century writing 6–9, 169, 174; in the Gothic 134; historicisation of 148–50; interrelationship of reason and passion 27, 30; links with the female reader 18; Mary Wollstonecraft on 3; masculinity of 3–4, 13, 44, 45, 112; negative depictions of 11–13; positive depictions of 8–10; reactionary readings of 61, 62, 171; in Scott's novels 146–7; as sexually transgressive 7, 10–11; as threat to women's role in the private sphere 12–13; see also *individual works*
- The Female Quixote* (Lennox) 18
- female quixotes 18
- female readers: dangers of female reading 76, 88–9, 95; as female quixotes 18; perceptions of 17–18; see also reading
- female violence: of Bertha, *Jane Eyre* 171–2; female creature, *Frankenstein* 135, 142–3, 151, 181; in *Zofloya* 136, 142–3
- femme philosophe, term 7, 11
- Fergus, Jane 17
- Fordyce, David 9
- The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck* (Shelley): engagement with Scott's fiction 134, 155; failure of radicalism 156; female education 158; female philosopher figure in 146, 154–5, 156, 157; Katherine's apologia 157–8; key role of women in 155–6; resurgence of autocratic regimes 156–7; role of the domestic sphere 157
- Frankenstein* (Shelley): circulation of manuscripts in 140; connection between the creature and female philosopher figure 141–2; on distinctions of rank 139; education and the creature 138–40; female philosopher figure in 137–8; focus on female experience of childbirth 136; isolation of alienated figures 141, 142, 143, 145; justice/love dialectic 136–7; Safie as Wollstonecraftian heroine 140–1; series of doubles 142, 144; violence of the female creature 135, 142–3, 151, 181; Wollstonecraft's life and work, allusions to 138
- French Revolution: effects of in Britain 18–19; and increased radical interpretations of female philosopher 11
- Fuseli, Henry 45, 47–8
- Garbin, Lidia 146
- Gay, Penny 127–8
- The Gentleman's Magazine* 86
- Godwin, William: correspondence with Hays 31, 32; correspondence with Wollstonecraft 37, 38–9, 40, 41–2, 46; on the domestic sphere 40–2, 157; Godwinian mentor figure, *Belinda* 92–3, 94; Hamilton's parody of political philosophy of 78, 79–81, 84, 94; Hays's critique of, *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* 30–5, 78; imaginations of Wollstonecraft and Godwin contrasted 39–40, 41, 46–7;

- marriage to Wollstonecraft 43–4, 67; political philosophy linked to Hottentot primitivism 84, 94; reassessment of the domestic sphere 40–2, 157; representations of Wollstonecraft 22–3, 37–42; satire of, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* 79–81; Wollstonecraft as Romantic heroine 37; on Wollstonecraft's writing style 45–6; see also *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*; *Political Justice*; *St Leon*
- Golightly, Jennifer 106
- Gore, Catherine 134, 159, 160; see also *Mrs Armytage*
- gothic genre: conservative Gothic romances 135; Female Gothic 133–4, 136, 137; gendered approaches to 135–6
- Greenfield, Susan C. 96
- Grenby, Matthew 64, 65, 102
- Grierson, Constantia 9
- Griffith, Elizabeth 9
- Grogan, Claire 63, 66, 82, 85
- Habermas, Jürgen 14–15, 38
- Hamilton, Elizabeth: argument with Mary Hays 77–9; obituary of, Maria Edgeworth 86, 87; political position of 62, 63, 64; Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in 61, 63, 64, 75, 96–7; see also *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*
- Handwerk, Gary 49–50
- Haslett, Moyra 8
- Hays, Mary: argument with Elizabeth Hamilton 77–9; correspondence with Godwin 31, 32; critique of women's confinement to the domestic sphere 172; obituary of Wollstonecraft 36–7; physical appearance of 173; representations of the female philosopher 1–2; representations of Wollstonecraft 1–2, 22–3, 24; review of *Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* 77–8, 79; revised preface, *Letters and Essays* 26; satire of, *Memoirs of Modern Philosophers* 79–81, 86; self-identification as female philosopher 11, 24; Wollstonecraft as mentor for 26, 27; Wollstonecraft's critique of 24–5; see also *Letters and Essays*; *Memoirs of Emma Courtney*; 'Memoirs of Wollstonecraft'
- Heath Malkin, Benjamin 12
- historical novels 134
- Hoeveler, Diane 115
- Holcroft, Thomas 51
- Hughes, Winifred 159
- imagination: Beatrice's concerns over, *Valperga* 152–3; and representation/self-representation 22; of Wollstonecraft/Godwin contrasted 39–40, 41, 46–7
- Imlay, Gilbert 37–8, 53, 56, 58–9, 67, 72
- Inchbald, Elizabeth 67, 127–9
- Italy 147, 148
- Jacobus, Mary 37–8
- Jane Eyre* (Brontë): Bertha as counter-revolutionary figure 171–2; contrasting female philosopher figures in 169–70; female education in 170; feminist perspective of Jane 172; Helen as Enlightenment female philosopher 170–1; Jane in the domestic sphere 173; marriage in 173
- Johnson, Claudia 2, 96, 102–3, 111, 115, 119, 132
- Kelly, Gary 18, 24, 29, 30–1, 51, 55, 75
- Kendra, April 160
- Klancher, Jon P. 18
- Knoepfmacher, U.C. 137
- Knox-Shaw, Peter 101, 115
- The Koran* 10–11
- Kotzebue, August von: *Lovers' Vows* 127–8; *The Stranger* 128–9
- Lennox, Charlotte 17–18
- Letters and Essays* (Hays): the emotions and the intellect 27; feminist philosophy in 26–7; link with *Vindication* 27–8; preface, Wollstonecraft's comments on 24–6; reviews of 27–8
- Letters Written in Sweden, Norway and Denmark* (Wollstonecraft) 66, 94
- literary production 14, 15–16
- Lodore* (Shelley): allusion to Wollstonecraft's critique of Milton's Eve 161–2; Fanny as female philosopher figure 160, 163–4; female education in 161–2, 163, 165; marriage in 165; maternal role 161, 164–5, 167; plot 160; social conventions and female behaviour 165–6
- Lynch, Deidre 146
- Mansfield Park* (Austen): on distinctions of rank 118–19; Edmund as Wollstonecraftian figure 126–7; Fanny Price's moral role within 116–18;

- Fanny's dissertation on memory 121;
female education in 116, 118–19, 120–1,
124, 130; figure of the female philoso-
pher in 116–18, 123–4, 125–7, 131;
marriage in 118, 122–4, 125–6, 128;
performance of *Lovers' Vows* 127–9; as
post-revolutionary texts 101; slave
trade and 114; treatment of adultery
129–30; Wollstonecraft's political
philosophy in 114–15, 131, 174
- Maria (The Wrongs of Woman)*
(Wollstonecraft) *see* *The Wrongs of
Woman (Maria)* (Wollstonecraft)
- marriage: in *Adeline Mowbray* 69–70,
71–4; courtship plots 103–4; in *Jane
Eyre* 173; in *Lodore* 165; in *Mansfield
Park* 118, 122–4, 125–6, 128; in *The
Wanderer* 111–12; of Wollstonecraft
and Godwin 43–4, 67
- Mary, A Fiction* (Wollstonecraft) 3
- McWhir, Anne 62
- Mellor, Anne 74, 75, 137, 141
- Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (Hays):
balance of reason and passion 30;
borrowings from, *Memoirs of
Modern Philosophers* 80–1; challenges
to female independence 34–5; critique
of Godwin's masculine bias 33–5, 78;
critique of Godwin's political
philosophy 30–4; epistolary form 28–9;
female philosopher figure in 1, 29–30,
36; literary criticism of 29; review of,
Anti-Jacobin Review 35–6
- Memoirs of Modern Philosophers*
(Hamilton): borrowings from *Memoirs
of Emma Courtney* 80–1; Bridgetina
and Julia as female quixotes 18;
dangers of female reading 76; as
endorsement of status quo 85–6; French
sensibilities and English patriotism 110;
Hamilton's feminist philosophy in
83–4, 85; interpretation in 76; the links
between Hottentot primitivism and
Godwin's political philosophy 84, 94;
narrative structure 75; parody of
Godwin's political philosophy 78,
79–81, 84, 94; review of, *The
Gentleman's Magazine* 86; satire of
Mary Hays 79–81, 86; separation of
Wollstonecraft's biography from
radical philosophy 75, 76–7, 81–3, 86–7;
social threat of female sexuality 85–6
- Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication
of the Rights of Woman'* (Godwin):
analysis of *Vindication* 44–5; effect of
Wollstonecraft on Godwin's political
philosophy 47, 48–9; female philosopher/
Romantic heroine split in 37–8; Godwin
and Wollstonecraft's first meeting 42–3;
Godwin's relationship with
Wollstonecraft 43–4; philosophy, use
of term 38, 41–2; rational Godwin vs.
intuitive Wollstonecraft 40–2;
representations of Wollstonecraft 22–3;
review of, *Anti-Jacobin Review* 62; in *St
Leon* 50–1; on Wollstonecraft's
relationship with Henry Fuseli 45, 47–8
- 'Memoirs of Wollstonecraft' (Hays):
Hays's analysis of *Vindication* 58; reli-
gious views 57–8; Wollstonecraft as
genius figure 56–7
- Meyer Spacks, Patricia 30
- Millenium Hall* (Scott) 8
- Moers, Ellen 133, 136, 137
- The Monk* (Lewis) 136, 137, 143
- Montagu, Elizabeth 7
- More, Hannah 13, 128–9
- Mrs Armytage* (Gore): female education
in 162, 166; female philosopher figure
in 162–3; maternal role in 161, 166–7;
plot 161
- Mulvey-Roberts, Marie 138
- Myers, Mitzi 48
- Nachumi, Nora 108, 109
- Napoleonic Wars 99, 104, 156
- novel: Austen's defense of 16–17; as a
feminine genre 17–18; Wollstonecraft's
attack on 16–17
- Ó Gallchoir, Cliona 63
- Opie, Amelia: friendship with Wollstone-
craft 66–7; political position of 62, 64;
Quakerism of 62–3; Wollstonecraft's
political philosophy in 61, 63, 64, 75,
96–7; *see also* *Adeline Mowbray*
- Opie, John 62, 72
- Pearson, Jacqueline 17
- Philp, Mark 47
- Pilkington, Laetitia 9
- Political Justice* (Godwin): on cohabitation/
marriage 72–3; critique of masculine
bias of, Hays 33–5, 78; disinterested
benevolence 48, 158; links between
Hottentot primitivism and Godwin's
political philosophy 84; parody of,
Memoirs of Modern Philosophers 78

- political public sphere: relationship with literary public sphere 14–15; women's access to 15–16, 104
- private sphere: female philosopher as threat to 12–13; reading and public literary production 14–15; relationship with the public sphere 14–15, 104; *see also* domestic sphere
- public sphere: access of women to 15–16, 104; corruption of by distinctions of rank 119; relationship with the private sphere 14–15; revisionist criticism of 38; women's role in political action 5, 13–14
- Rajan, Tilottama 29
- reading: dangers of female reading 76, 88–9, 95; female reader, perceptions of 17–18; female readers as female quixotes 18; impact of French Revolution on 18–19; practice of and the public sphere 14–15; in *St Leon* (Godwin) 52, 53; transformative power of, *Frankenstein* 139–40
- reason: balance with emotions 27, 30; in *Memoirs of Emma Courtney* (Hays) 30; reason/passion combination, Wollstonecraft 37, 46, 56, 58–9
- Reflections on the Revolution in France* (Burke) 4
- Robertson, Fiona 155
- Robinson, Charles 138, 140
- Rogers, Katharine 105
- Rousseau, Jean-Jacques 39, 82, 90, 95
- Scott, Sarah 8
- Scott, Walter: depiction of women as female philosopher figures 146–7; *Rob Roy* 147; *Waverley* 99, 147; *Waverley* novels 134, 146, 155
- sexuality: adultery 128–30; attacks on Wollstonecraft 6, 61; female philosopher as sexually transgressive 7, 10–11; female sexuality as social threat 85–6; primitive sexuality of the Hottentots 84, 85; threatening sexual power, Bertha in *Jane Eyre* 171–2
- Shelley, Mary: engagement with Scott's historical novels 146; engagement with Wollstonecraft 132, 135, 174; female philosopher figure in 132, 134–5, 168; *Matilda* 146; use of the Gothic 134; *see also* *Frankenstein*; *Lodore*; *The Fortunes of Perkin Warbeck*
- Showalter, Elaine 173–4
- silver fork novels 134, 159–60; *see also* *Lodore*
- Skelton, Philip 10
- Spacks, Patricia Meyer 30
- St Leon* (Godwin): corruption of the philosopher's stone 52–3, 54; distorting effects of nostalgia 55–6; interrelationship of public action and private behaviour 49–51, 93; Marguerite de Damville as representation of Wollstonecraft 51–2, 53; as Post-Jacobin text 101; reading, activity of 52, 53; references to in *Belinda* 92–3; reviews of, *Anti-Jacobin Review* 49; use of *Memoirs* in 50–1
- Taylor, Barbara 2, 22, 58
- Thoughts on the Education of Daughters* (Wollstonecraft) 138
- Translation of the Letters of a Hindoo Rajah* (Hamilton) 77–8, 79
- Trott, Nicola 23
- True Taste; or, Female Philosophy* (Sylvia) 10
- Trumpener, Katie 65
- Ty, Eleanor 29, 65, 72
- Valperga (Shelley): attack on the imagination 152–3; Beatrice as counter-revolutionary female philosopher figure 148, 151–4; Euthanasia as ideal female ruler 147, 150–1, 153–4; female agency and political reform in 147, 148, 149, 151; female education 149; historicisation of the female philosopher 148–50; private/public sphere contrasts 150, 151
- Vargo, Lisa 162
- A Vindication of the Rights of Men* (Wollstonecraft) 3–4
- A Vindication of the Rights of Women* (Wollstonecraft): authorial tone of 44–5; critical responses to 4–6; critique of hypocritical courtship behaviour 126; on distinctions of rank 119, 139; female education 5, 116, 120; female independence from men 35; Godwin's analysis of, *Memoirs* 44–5; Hays's analysis of 58; humility/modesty distinction 26; links with *Letters and Essays* (Hays) 27–8; on Milton's portrayal of Eve 161–2; radical politics of 5; review of, *Anti-Jacobin Review* 6; use of in *Frankenstein* 138; Wollstonecraft's self-representation in 44–5
- violence *see* female violence

Waldron, Mary 129

Walker, Gina Luria 12, 24, 27, 37

Wallace, Tara Ghoshal 106

The Wanderer (Burney): Ellis's first marriage in 111–12; 'England in 1819' 100–1; Female Difficulties of 105, 109, 111, 113; female identity in 105; gendered expectations of female behaviour 105–6, 108–9; Hazlitt's review of 109; narrative structure 103; the personal and the political in 103–4, 107; political allegiances of 102, 104; as post-revolutionary text 101, 103; revolutionary feminism in 96, 106–8, 109, 111, 112; stability/reform tensions 102; value of female friendship 110; Wollstonecraft's political philosophy in 106, 113–14, 130–1; women's independence in society 113; women's work in 102–3, 110–11

Waters, Mary A. 24, 25

Watt, James 135

Weiss, Deborah 92

Welsh, Alexander 146

Wilt, Judith 146

Wollstonecraft, Mary: condemnation of stupid novelists 16–17; correspondence with Godwin 37, 38–9, 40, 41–2, 46; correspondence with Imlay 37–8, 53, 56, 58–9; critique of Hays's self-presentation 24–5; disassociation from female philosopher 4, 6; elision with female philosopher figure 2; on the female philosopher 3; friendship with Opie 66–7; Hays's obituary of 36–7; interrelationship of reason and passion

in 37, 46, 56, 58–9; Marguerite de Damville as representation of 51–2, 53; marriage and social difficulties 43–4, 67; *Mary, A Fiction* 3; masculine/feminine representations of 4, 36, 44–5, 58; relationship with Henry Fuseli 45, 47–8; religious beliefs 57–8, 74; representations of, Mary Hays 1–2, 22–3, 24; as revolutionary feminist 8; suicide attempts 107; use of male pronoun 25; *A Vindication of the Rights of Men* 3–4; writing style of 25, 45–6; see also *A Vindication of the Rights of Women*; *Memoirs of the Author of 'A Vindication of the Rights of Woman'*; 'Memoirs of Wollstonecraft'; *The Wrongs of Woman* (Maria)

women: authors tackling the historical moment 99–100; as between public and private spheres 15–17; self-presentation of female authors 24, 25–6

working class radicalism 100–1

The Wrongs of Woman (Maria)

(Wollstonecraft): Godwin's possible conclusion 74; interpretative freedom of 96–7; mockery of Godwinian ideals 83; overview of 69–70; review of, *Anti-Jacobin Review* 61–2; social hypocrisy in 71

Wyett, Jodi 106

Zofloya; or, the Moor (Dacre): as Female Gothic 137; female violence and 136, 142–3; series of doubles 142–4; Zofloya as moral arbitrator 143–5

Zonana, Joyce 138, 140–1